Advances in Crusades Research

THE BATTLE RHETORIC OF CRUSADE AND HOLY WAR, C. 1099–C. 1222

Connor Christopher Wilson

The Battle Rhetoric of Crusade and Holy War, c. 1099–c. 1222

This book examines Latin narratives produced in the aftermath of the First Crusade and challenges the narrative of supposed brutality and amorality of warfare in this period—instead focusing on the moral and didactic concerns surrounding warfare and violence with which medieval authors wrestled.

The battle oration, a rousing harangue exhorting warriors to deeds of valour, has been regarded as a significant aspect of warfare since the age of Xenophon, and has continued to influence conceptions of campaigning and combat to the present day. While its cultural and chronological pervasiveness attests to the power of this trope, scholarly engagement with the literary phenomenon of the pre-battle speech has been limited. Moreover, previous work on medieval battle rhetoric has only served to reinforce the supposed brutality and amorality of warfare in this period, highlighting appeals to martial prowess, a hatred for 'the enemy' and promises of wealth and glory. This book, through an examination of Latin narratives produced in the aftermath of the First Crusade and the decades that followed, challenges this understanding and illuminates the moral and didactic concerns surrounding warfare and violence with which medieval authors wrestled. Furthermore, while battle orations form a clear mechanism by which the fledgling crusading movement could be explored ideologically, this comparative study reveals how non-crusading warfare in this period was also being reconceptualised in light of changing ideas about just war, authority and righteousness in Christian society.

This volume is perfect for researchers, students and scholars alike interested in medieval history and military studies.

Connor Christopher Wilson is an historian of the early and central Middle Ages, with a particular interest in the Crusades, the Crusader States, monasticism and monastic writing. His PhD thesis was completed in 2018 at Royal Holloway, University of London. He has lectured in History at Lancaster University.

Advances in Crusades Research

Series Editor: Natasha Hodgson
Nottingham Trent University, UK

Advances in Crusades Research provides a forum for specialist scholars working on crusading and its ideology wherever crusading had an historical impact. The chronological scope of the series is broad, extending into the twenty-first century, but the focus remains on crusade as an historical field of enquiry rather than a political one relating explicitly to the modern day. The series welcomes and actively seeks monograph proposals from scholars in all fields and disciplines related to crusade historiography, history and areas of conflict/settlement from differing social, economic, ideological, military, cultural and material perspectives. Contributions from Islamic, Jewish, Eastern Christian or any other relevant perspectives are welcomed, as are cross-cultural and interdisciplinary approaches. Preference will be given to proposals employing new methodologies and exploring new subject areas.

The Rise and Fall of British Crusader Medievalism, c. 1825–1945
Mike Horswell

Recalcitrant Crusaders?
The Relationship Between Southern Italy and Sicily, Crusading and the Crusader States, c. 1060–1198
Paula Z. Hailstone

Finance and the Crusades
England, c.1213–1337
Daniel Edwards

Nubia, Ethiopia, and the Crusading World, 1095–1402
Adam Simmons

The Battle Rhetoric of Crusade and Holy War, c. 1099–c. 1222
Connor Christopher Wilson

The Battle Rhetoric of Crusade and Holy War, c. 1099–c. 1222

Connor Christopher Wilson

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published December 2022
by Routledge
4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2023 Connor Christopher Wilson

The right of Connor Christopher Wilson to be identified as author of this work has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Wilson, Connor Christopher, author.
Title: The battle rhetoric of crusade and holy war, c. 1099-c. 1222 / Connor Christopher Wilson.
Description: New York : Routledge, 2023. | Series: Advances in crusader research | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Contents: Acknowledgements -- Abbreviations -- Note on translations -- Introduction -- Chapter One: The battle oration and Classical rhetoric -- Chapter Two: 'No war of the flesh, but of the spirit': the battle rhetoric of penitential pilgrimage -- Chapter Three: The victory of the familia Christi and the development of crusade ideology -- Chapter Four: Justice, authority and legitimate violence in holy war -- Chapter Five: Vengeance, martyrdom and heroic failure in military service to Christ -- Conclusions -- Bibliography.
Identifiers: LCCN 2022028103 (print) | LCCN 2022028104 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Crusades--History--Sources. | Latin literature, Medieval and modern--History and criticism. | Oratory--History--Sources. | War and literature--History--To 1500.
Classification: LCC D160 .W55 2021 (print) | LCC D160 (ebook) | DDC 909.07--dc23/eng/20220726
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2022028103
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2022028104

ISBN: 978-0-367-49118-5 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-032-36530-5 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-04461-1 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003044611

Typeset in Times New Roman
by MPS Limited, Dehradun

For my mother and father.

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Contents

	Acknowledgements	viii
	Abbreviations	ix
	Note on translations	xiii
	Introduction	1
1	The Battle Oration and Classical Rhetoric	16
2	'No War of the Flesh, but of the Spirit': The Battle Rhetoric of Penitential Pilgrimage	49
3	The Victory of the *Familia Christi* and the Development of Crusade Ideology	70
4	Justice, Authority and Legitimate Violence in Holy War	122
5	Vengeance, Martyrdom and Heroic Failure in Military Service to Christ	167
	Conclusions	216
	Bibliography	232
	Index	254

Acknowledgements

During the course of writing this book, I have benefited enormously from the support of a number of individuals who deserve my thanks. Firstly, I would like to give my utmost thanks to the supervisors of my doctoral thesis, on which the present work is based. The advice, encouragement and knowledge of Professor Andrew Jotischky and Dr. Damien Kempf has been invaluable from the initiation of my research to the submission of the thesis and beyond. I would also like to thank Dr. Paul Hayward and Dr. Fiona Edmonds for their comments upon the thesis's earliest chapters, which have benefited to the development of this work. For his excellent Latin tuition and assistance with translations, although any errors are of course my own, I would like to thank Professor John Thorley. For their welcoming support during my transferral of registration from Lancaster University to Royal Holloway, University of London, I would like to thank my advisor Professor Jonathan Harris and Ms. Jane Gawthrope. This research was funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, for which I am incredibly grateful. Thanks for financial assistance must also go to the Lancaster University History Department, Lancaster University Graduate College, Royal Holloway History Department and the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East.

The support of a number of friends and family has also been tremendously important to me while undertaking this research. Guidance in all aspects of post-graduate life was generously given by James Doherty and Philip Booth. I would also like to thank Martin Walker and Polina Ignatova of Lancaster University History Department. Thanks also go to James Kane and Adrian Cornell du Houx for allowing me to consult their own unpublished PhD theses. For their technical support I would like to thank Justin Dee and Domonic Bailey. For proofreading much or all of this work, I would like to also express sincere thanks to Rachel Westra, Philip Hitchings and Richard Hitchings.

Lastly, I want to express my deep thanks to my partner, Kathryn Elske Flasby, as well as to my parents Colin and June Wilson for their continued enthusiastic support and encouragement throughout the entirety of my time studying and beyond. This book is dedicated to them.

Abbreviations

AA Albert of Aachen, *Albert of Aachen: Historia Ierosolimitana: History of the Journey to Jerusalem*, ed. and trans. by Susan B. Edgington, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

AF Andrew of Fleury, *Les Miracles de Saint Benoît écrits par Adrevald, Aimoin, André, Raoul Tortaire, et Hugues de Sainte Marie moines de Fleury Réunis et Publiés Pour la Société de l'histoire de France*, ed. by Eugène de Certain (Paris: Jules Renouard, 1858).

AM Ambroise, *The History of the Holy War: Ambroise's Estoire de la guerre sainte*, ed. by Marianne Ailes and Malcolm Barber, trans. by Marianne Ailes, 2 vols (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2003).

BB Baldric of Bourgueil, *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil*, ed. by Steven Biddlecombe (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2014).

BP Benedict of Peterborough [attributed], *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi et Gesta Regis Ricardi Benedicti abbatis*, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series 49, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1867).

DEL *The Conquest of Lisbon: De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, ed. by Charles W. David, with a new foreword by Jonathan Phillips, Records of Western Civilization Series (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2001).

EH Gerald of Wales, *Expugnatio Hibernica: The Conquest of Ireland by Giraldus Cambrensis*, ed. by A. Brian Scott and Francis X. Martin, New History of Ireland (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1978).

FC Fulcher of Chartres, *Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia Hierosolymitana (1095–1127)*, ed. by Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 1913).

GA Balderic of Florennes, *Gesta Alberonis archiepiscopi auctore Balderico*, ed. by Georg Waitz, Monumenta Germaniae historica Scriptores in folio et quarto, 8 (Hannover: Impensis bibliopolii Avlici Hahniani, 1851).

GF *Gesta Francorum: The Deeds of the Franks and the other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*, ed. by Roger Mynors trans. by Rosalind Hill, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).

GM Geoffrey Malaterra, *De rebus gestis Rogerii Calabriae et Siciliae comitis et Roberti Guiscardi ducis fratris eius*, ed. by Ernesto Pontieri, Rerum Italicarum Scriptores 5, 1 (Bologna: N. Zanichelli, 1928).

GN Guibert of Nogent, *Guibert de Nogent Dei gesta per Francos et cinq autres textes*, ed. by Robert B. C. Huygens, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis, 127A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996).

GT Ralph of Caen, *Radulphi Cadomensis Tancredus*, ed. by Edoardo D'Angelo (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011).

HB Helmold of Bosau, *Helmoldi, presbyteri, Cronica Slavorum recensione I.M. Lappenbergii in usum schlolarum ex monumentis germaniae historicis*, ed. by Georg Heinrich Pertz, Scriptores rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum ex Monumenta germania historicio separatim editi, 31 (Hannover: Impensis bibliopolii Hahniani, 1868).

HBS *Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusolymarum (olim Tudebodus imitatus et continuatus): I Normanni d'Italia alla prima Crociata in una cronaca cassinese*, ed. by Edoardo D'Angelo (Florence: SISMEL - Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2009).

HEF *Historia de expeditione Friderici I imperatoris* in Anton Chroust (ed.), *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I: Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris et quidam alii rerum gestarum fontes eiusdem expeditionis*. Monumenta Germaniae historica scriptores rerum Germanicarum nova series, 5 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), pp. 1–115.

HH Henry of Huntingdon, *Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon: Historia Anglorum: The History of the English People*, ed. and trans. by Diana E. Greenway, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

HP *Historia Peregrinorum* in Anton Chroust (ed.), *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I: Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris et quidam alii rerum gestarum fontes eiusdem expeditionis*. Monumenta Germaniae historica scriptores rerum Germanicarum nova series, 5 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), pp. 116–72.

IO Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, trans. Harold Edgeworth Butler, 4 vols (London: William Heinemann, 1920–1922).

IP *The Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi; Auctore, ut Videtur, Ricardo, Canonico Sanctæ Trinitatis Londoniensis*, *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I.,* ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 38, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1864–1865).

LTC Lisiard of Tours, *Lisiardus Turonensis Clericus Historia Hierosolymitana*, *PL*, 174, 1589–1634.

LTS Kegan Brewer and James Kane (eds.), *The Conquest of the Holy Land by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn: A critical edition and translation of the anonymous Libellus de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019).

MC *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis,* ed. by Hartmut Hoffman, Monumenta Germaniae historica scriptores, 34 (Hannover: Hahn, 1980).

OV Orderic Vitalis, *Orderici Vitalis Historia Æcclesiastica. The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. by Marjorie Chibnall, Oxford Medieval Texts, 6 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968–1980).

PL Jacques P. Migne (ed.) *Patrologiae cursus completus: series latina*, 221 vols. (Paris, 1844–1864).

PT Peter Tudebode, *Petrus Tudebodus: Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, ed. by John H. Hill & Laurita L. Hill, Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades, 12 (Paris: Geuthner, 1977).

RAH *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, trans. by Henry Caplan, Loeb Classical Library, 403 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954).

RD Richard of Devizes, *Cronicon Richardi Divisensis de Tempore Regis Richardi Primi, The Chronicle of Richard of Devizes of the Time of King Richard the First*, ed. and trans. by John T. Appleby, Nelson Medieval Texts (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1963).

RC Ralph of Coggeshall, *Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon anglicanum, De expugnatione Terrae Sanctae libellus; Thomas Agnellus De morte et sepultura Henrici regis Angliae junioris; Gesta Fulconis filii Warini; Excerpta ex Otiis imperialibus Gervasii Tilebutiensis*, ed. by Joseph Stephenson, Rolls Series, 66 (London: Longman, 1875), pp. 1–208.

RH Roger of Howden, *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 51, 4 vols (London: Longman, 1868–1871).

RM Robert the Monk, *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, ed. by Marcus G. Bull and Damien Kempf (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013).

RS Aelred of Rievaulx, '*Relatio de Standardo*', in *Chronicles of the reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. by Richard Howlett, Rolls Series, 82, 4 vols (London: Longman, 1886), pp. 181–201.

WP William of Poitiers, *The Gesta Gvillelmi of William of Poitiers*, ed. and trans. by Ralph H. C. Davis and Marjorie Chibnall, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

WT William of Tyre, *Willemi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon*, ed. by Robert B. C. Huygens, Hans Eberhard Mayer, and Gerhard Rösch, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis, 63–63A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1986).

Note on translations

All quoted non-English material analysed in this dissertation has been given an accompanying translation. Where no published translation is referenced all translations are my own.

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Introduction

Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (written *c*. 370 BC) recounts that when Cyrus the Great was asked by his companion Chrysantas, to speak to the assembled Persian soldiers before battle against an Assyrian army, Cyrus supposedly replied: 'There is no exhortation so noble that it will in a single day make good those who are not good when they hear it. It could not make good bowmen, unless they had previously practised with care, nor spearmen, nor knights'.[1] Despite the professed scepticism of the power of words to improve the quality of soldiery, Xenophon claims that the Assyrians received their own exhortation, and Cyrus himself, not long after his protest, also conformed with the custom.

In detailing the final defeat and death of Lucius Sergius Catilina, the first-century BC Roman senator who had sought to overthrow the consulship of Marcus Tullius Cicero and Gaius Antonius Hybrida, Sallust claims that it was only when Catilina was trapped between a Roman army and impassable mountains that he resolved to try the 'fortune of war'. Having committed to battle, Catilina assembled and addressed his soldiers, beginning with a sentiment that echoes Cyrus, deploying the common rhetorical device of *apophasis*, denying something as a means of implicitly affirming it:

> 'I am well aware, soldiers', he said, 'that mere words cannot put courage into a man: that a frightened army cannot be rendered brave, or a sluggish one transformed into a keen one, by a speech from its commander. Everyman has a certain degree of boldness, either natural or acquired by training; so much, and no more, does he generally show in battle. If a man is stirred neither by the prospect of glory nor by danger, it is a waste of time to exhort him; the fear that is in his heart

1 Wayne Ambler (trans.), *The Education of Cyrus,* by Xenophon (Ithaca, NY, 2001), p. 108.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003044611-1

> makes him deaf. However, I have called you together to give you a few words of advice and to tell you the reason for my present purpose'.[2]

Yet, raising the morale of his soldiers through a public oration before battle was joined is of course exactly what Catilina, as he is presented by Sallust, was hoping to do. Modern familiarity with this convention, whether it be in a military context or not, is no doubt in part due to the chronologically pervasive nature of the genre. Considering only western historical narratives, influential literary examples of pre-battle orations are to be found in considerable number and varied circumstance. In the Greco-Roman tradition, Book Five of the *Iliad* presents an exhortation to the Achaeans at Troy, delivered by King Agamemnon of Mycenae: 'Be men now, dear friends, and take up the heart of courage, and have consideration for each other in the strong encounters, since more come through alive when men consider each other, and there is no glory when they give way, nor warcraft either'.[3] Likewise, in the final book of his *Aeneid*, Virgil has Aeneas deliver a speech before the climactic Trojan assault upon the Latins, wherein perishes the titular hero's nemesis Turnus.[4] Beyond the epic genre, Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* has been noted for the regularity with which it depicts battle orations, even if some were 'long enough only to urge them [Caesar's soldiers] to remember their long-established record for bravery, and not to lose their nerve but to resist the enemy assault with courage'.[5]

In the Judeo-Christian tradition, while Christ was understood to have been the foretold Prince of Peace by the prophet Isaiah,[6] the wars of the Old Testament were an apt setting for rhetorical exhortation, with examples being found in Deuteronomy, Joshua, 1 and 2 Chronicles and 1 and 2 Maccabees.[7] Indeed, the ordinances and laws of warfare established by Moses in Deuteronomy 20 prescribes battle rhetoric as a duty of the Israelite leaders:

> If thou go out to war against thy enemies, and see horsemen and chariots, and the numbers of the enemy's army greater than thine, thou

2 Leighton D. Reynolds (ed.), *C. Sallusti Crispi: Catalina, Ivgvrtha, Historiavm Fragmenta Selecta, Appendix Sallvstiana* (Oxford, 1991), p. 95. Sallust, *The Jugurthine War/The Conspiracy of Catiline*, trans. by S. A. Handford (Middlesex, 1987), p. 229.

3 Richmond Lattimore (trans.), *The Iliad of Homer* (Chicago, IL, 1951), 5.529–32.

4 Book XII, 554–73. Virgil, *The Aeneid*, trans. by William F. J. Knight (Harmondsworth, 1956), p. 326.

5 Caesar, *Seven Commentaries on the Gallic Wars*, trans. by Carolyn Hammond (Oxford, 1998), 2.20–21. Keith Yellin, *Battle Exhortation: The Rhetoric of Combat Leadership* (Columbia, SC, 2008), pp. 7–8, 14, 130.

6 Isiah 9:6.

7 Deuteronomy 31:6–7, 31:23; Joshua 1:6–7, 1:9, 1:18, 10:25; 1 Chronicles 22:13; 28:20; 2 Chronicles 32:7.

> shalt not fear them: because the Lord thy God is with thee, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt. And when the battle is now at hand, the priest shall stand before the army, and shall speak to the people in this manner: Hear, O Israel, you join battle this day against your enemies, let not your heart be dismayed, be not afraid, do not give back, fear ye them not: Because the Lord your God is in the midst of you, and will fight for you against your enemies, to deliver you from danger. And the captains shall proclaim through every band in the hearing of the army: What man is there, that hath built a new house, and hath not dedicated it? let him go and return to his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man dedicate it. What man is there, that hath planted a vineyard, and hath not as yet made it to be common, whereof all men may eat? let him go, and return to his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man execute his office. What man is there, that hath espoused a wife, and not taken her? let him go, and return to his house, lest he die in the war, and another man take her. After these things are declared they shall add the rest, and shall speak to the people: What man is there that is fearful, and faint hearted? let him go, and return to his house, lest he make the hearts of his brethren to fear, as he himself is possessed with fear. And when the captains of the army shall hold their peace, and have made an end of speaking, every man shall prepare their bands to fight.[8]

Anne Curry has drawn attention to the scriptural influence, specifically 1 Maccabees 3:17–19, upon one of the most famous battle speeches of all time, delivered by Henry V. Supposedly taking place at the Battle of Agincourt on 25 October 1415, this oration is best remembered not for its chronicle versions but its inspiring rendering by William Shakespeare.[9] In her examination of the varied versions of that speech, Curry has stressed that a reconstruction of Henry's actual words, if such a speech took place, are of course impossible. However, the expansion and development of literacy, as well as of the increasingly detailed nature of military records over the past half millennium, has allowed modern scholarship closer proximity to what can reliably be considered the actual exhortation of commanders. The speech of Elizabeth I to the English soldiers at Tilbury (9 August 1588), subsequently recorded in a letter by the churchman Leonel Sharp to the Duke of Buckingham, has been argued to be a copy, perhaps twice or three times removed, of a version written by the queen herself. This is in spite of the existence of several other distinct variations.[10] Moreover, in the western historical tradition, the phenomenon of battle speeches transcended the

8 Deuteronomy 20:1–9.

9 Act IV, scene iii, 18–67. Anne Curry, 'The Battle Speeches of Henry V', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 34 (2008), pp. 82–3.

10 John E. Neale, *Essays in Elizabethan History* (London, 1958), pp. 105–6.

medieval and early modern battlefield, with examples of recognizably familiar battle rhetoric being crafted by serving officers during the 2003–2011 Iraq War, as well as by leaders in the ongoing (15 March 2011–present) Syrian Civil War.[11]

Outside of a historical context, the familiarity of this convention to a modern audience is no doubt due in part to the not inconsiderable influence of its place in film and literature on contemporary culture. Hollywood cinema has produced some of the most recognizable examples of the pre-battle speech in the genres of science fiction and fantasy. The 1996 blockbuster *Independence Day,* which shortly after its release became the second highest grossing film of all time, included the oration of a fictionalized US President who personally takes part in the following battle as a fighter pilot.[12] Similarly, the final instalment of the 2001–2003 fantasy trilogy *The Lord of the Rings*, featured a pre-battle speech by the titular king Aragorn, which naturally encompassed many of the story's most prominent themes. *The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King* continues to retain its place amongst the most successful cinema releases ever.[13] Perhaps the most famous example from historically inspired cinema is the campaign-launching oration found in Franklin J. Schaffner's 1970 biopic *Patton*.[14] While the phenomenon or trope of the pre-battle speech thus looms large in the contemporary imagining of warfare both ancient and modern, it is arguable that this notion would have been as familiar to a medieval audience. A multitude of contemporary, or near contemporary, narrative accounts attest to the idea that, prior or sometimes during battle, medieval soldiers received public orations that sought to raise morale and reinforce the willingness of men to fight, and if necessary, to die rather than allow their forces to suffer a rout. This significant corpus of sources, that includes both classical and medieval material, make it easy to believe that in the medieval world it was common practice for an army's leadership to publicly address assembled soldiers, or perhaps groups of officers, following a commander's decision to commit to battle. The address itself most often occurs before the commencement of combat, although there are a substantial number of examples where the exhortation takes place as the fighting is occurring.

11 NBC Enterprises, *Operation Iraqi Freedom: The Insider Story* (Kansas City, MO, 2003), p. 103. James Mattis, 'A Marine's Letter to His Troops', *Dallas Morning News*, 21 March 2004. Dexter Filkins, 'Hezbola Widens the Syrian War', *The New Yorker*, 26 May 2013, https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/hezbollah-widens-the-syrian-war (accessed 29 November 2017).

12 *Independence Day*, DVD, directed by Roland Emmerich (Los Angeles, CA: 20th Century Fox, 1996).

13 *The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King*, DVD, directed by Peter Jackson (Burbank, CA: New Line Cinema, 2003).

14 *Patton*, DVD, directed by Franklin J. Schaffner (Beverly Hills, CA: 20th Century Fox, 1970).

This book centres on the textual phenomenon of battle rhetoric, from a largely western European perspective, over the course of a slightly elongated twelfth century. In the context of medieval historiography, it has long been recognized that the set piece, pre-battle orations found in medieval narratives are largely rhetorical inventions,[15] which were nevertheless influenced by both the reality and wider expectation of pre-battle exhortations. These complex, often highly literary speeches, would not however be understood by oration authors or their audiences as 'mere rhetoric'.[16] Medieval authors often turned to classical rhetorical manuals to help them construct their histories,[17] and clearly understood that the 'embellishment' of words had a complex relationship to the truths that they depicted.[18] The classical tradition of rhetoric had long influenced Christian preaching by the days of Pope Gregory I, and reached back through Augustine of Hippo and Tertullian, perhaps to the very first educated Romans to convert to Christianity. This tradition established for the educated clergy, who were more often than not the authors of battle orations, the idea that rhetoric was the means by which people could be persuaded to believe and act in a manner desired by the speaker.[19]

These instances of direct speech at dramatic points within a wider narrative were of course opportunities for authors to enliven their work and display their literary and rhetorical talent. While they often contain non-hortatory content, such as orders from commanders to soldiers, most of the content of these speeches is hortatory, containing a variety of different motivational appeals that seek to encourage the soldiers being spoken to. These motivational appeals have been previously understood as largely interchangeable.[20] However, it will be demonstrated herein that while there are clearly recognizable tropes and recurring themes of battle orations, these ideas were not deployed unthinkingly or in a rote fashion. From its origins in classical historical narratives, the battle oration was an opportunity for authors to present particular and purposeful constructions of warfare, as

15 Susan Edgington, 'The First Crusade: reviewing the evidence', in *The First Crusade: Origins and Impact*, ed. Jonathan Phillips (Manchester, 1997), pp. 57–77.

16 David S. Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility: Clerical Representation of Battlefield Orations against Muslims, 1080–1170', *The International History Review*, 26: 1 (2004), p. 2.

17 Nancy F. Partner, 'The New Cornificius: Medieval History and the Artifice of Words', in *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography,* ed. by Ernst Breisach (Kalamazoo, MI, 1985), p. 10.

18 Ruth Morse, *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation and Reality* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 2.

19 James J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of the Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (London, 1981), p. 279.

20 John R. E. Bliese, 'Aelred of Rievaulx's Rhetoric and Morale at the Battle of the Standard, 1138', *Albion*, 20: 4 (1988), p. 546.

well as reinforce the wider themes of their narratives, through direct speech at climactic moments.

In his account of Gnaeus Julius Agricola's conquest of Britain, Tacitus recounts a battle oration supposedly delivered by the Caledonian chieftain Calgacus at the Battle of Mons Graupius. This speech, which in common classical fashion is mirrored by a speech delivered to the Romans by Agricola himself, contains a number of themes common to medieval battle orations, as well as a deeper message:

> Whenever I consider the causes of the war and our desperate position, I have great confidence that today, the day on which you are of one mind, will mark the beginning of freedom for the whole of Britain. For all of you have united together, and you have not tasted servitude. There is no land beyond us and even the sea is no safe refuge when we are threatened by the Roman fleet. Thus battle and arms, which brave men honour, are the safest recourse even for cowards. Battles have been fought against the Romans before, with varying success. But our forces were the Britons' hope and their reserve, for we, the noblest in all Britain, who dwell in her innermost sanctuary and do not look across at any subject shores, had been keeping ever our eyes free from the defilement of tyranny. We are the last people on earth, and the last to be free: our very remoteness in a land known only to rumour has protected us up till this day. Today the furthest bounds of Britain lie open and everything unknown is given an inflated worth. But now there is no people beyond us, nothing but tides and rocks and, more deadly than these, the Romans. It is no use trying to escape their arrogance by submission or good behaviour. They have pillaged the world: when the land has nothing left for men who ravage everything, they scour the sea. If an enemy is rich, they are greedy, if he is poor, they crave glory. Neither East nor West can sate their appetite. They are the only people on earth to covet wealth and poverty with equal craving. They plunder, they butcher, they ravish, and call it by the lying name of 'empire'. They make a desert and call it 'peace'.[21]

Calgacus's oration is not just an exhortation to raise the morale of his Caledonian soldiers, but an implicit criticism of the Roman state which

21 Anthony J. Woodman (ed.) with C. S. Kraus, *Agricola,* by Tacitus (Cambridge, 2014), chapters XXXII–XXXIII. Tacitus, *Agricola and Germany*, trans. A. R. Birley (Oxford, 1999), pp. 21–2. While this example would not have been known widely in the medieval world, it has been argued that several authors, including authors of battle rhetoric, were familiar with Agricola. These included Adam of Bremen and Peter the Deacon. Leighton D. Reynolds (ed.) *Texts and Transmission: A survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983), p. 410.

serves to reinforce Tacitus's wider criticisms of the tyranny of the empire and specifically the despotism of the Emperor Domitian.[22]

While it is difficult to underestimate the influence of classical models of battle orations, especially from popular works such as Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* and *Bellum Iugurthinum*, it is important to note that medieval oration authors did not simply copy from the classics, as has occasionally been suggested.[23] In the introduction to Raymonde Foreville's edition of William of Poitiers, Foreville argued that William copied the harangue at the Battle of Hastings from Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*.[24] However, a comparison between these two speeches displays little direct borrowing.[25] Foreville focuses on the parallel claim that the soldiers cannot flee, but this *topos* is common to both classical and medieval orations.[26] Moreover, as Chapter One will demonstrate, by the twelfth century, classical examples of battle rhetoric were but one of myriad literary influences drawn upon by oration authors.

The Debate on Battle Orations

Despite the frequency with which battle orations are drawn upon by modern historians, the previous scholarship on medieval battle rhetoric has been limited. Most notable on the topic is the work of Bliese, who surveyed widely battle rhetoric in western European narratives written between 1000 and 1250.[27] His analysis focused on the 'specific appeals and persuasive strategies' of the examined orations, and argued that compiling these results allowed the construction of a 'vocabulary of motives in war',[28] which highlighted 17 identifiable appeals that reoccurred with some frequency.[29] Centrally, Bliese argued that his typology of 'motivational appeals' could be used in order to provide an insight into the psychology of warfare in the medieval period.[30] While he accepted that battle orations were not verbatim reports of actual speeches, but rhetorical inventions, Bliese argued that

22 Thomas A. Dorey, 'Agricola and Domitian', *Greece and Rome*, 7: 1 (1960), pp. 66–71. Matthew Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400–1500* (Manchester, 2011), p. 520.

23 Beryl Smalley, *Historians in the Middle Ages* (London, 1974), p. 20.

24 Raymonde Foreville (ed.), *Histoire de Guillaume le Conquérant* (Paris, 1952), p. xxxix, 184 n. 1.

25 John R. E. Bliese, 'The Courage of the Normans – A Comparative Study of Battle Rhetoric', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 35 (1991), p. 2 n. 1.

26 Bliese, 'The Courage of the Normans', p. 4.

27 Bliese, 'The Courage of the Normans', pp. 21–6.

28 John R. E. Bliese, 'Rhetoric and Morale: A Study of Battle Orations from the cEntral Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 15 (1989), p. 204.

29 Bliese, 'Rhetoric and Morale', pp. 204–17. Although these appeals number only 16 and in a different order in his 'The Courage of the Normans', pp. 3–4.

30 Bliese, 'Rhetoric and Morale', p. 201.

oration authors would have employed the appeals that they believed should have been used, and were the most effective at convincing men to fight.[31]

This methodology has several issues. Broadly, the analysis fails to contextualize examined orations within the wider narratives in which they are found. More specifically to a crusading context, the narrow typology fails to identify elements of battle orations that set such speeches apart from many similar 'non-crusading' speeches, such as liturgical elements, scriptural references and notions of pilgrimage and penance. This book contends that these elements are crucial to understanding the message of such speeches, as well as the wider narratives in which they appear. Bliese characterized most battle orations as 'generic and largely interchangeable' and as seldom specific to individual speakers.[32] While myriad examples herein defy this understanding of battle rhetoric, an illustrative example of the issues of a limited typology is valuable here.

Bliese described the appeal to 'the tradition of victory', the eighth most common appeal of his survey, as the recognition of past military successes attained not only by the audience but also their ancestors.[33] While understanding why such an appeal would be effective seems obvious, there is much that is ill defined about this categorization. An examination of instances where appeals to 'the tradition of victory' occur reveals how the meaning or significance of such an idea within the narrative in which is it found can vary drastically depending on its form, details and circumstance. Gerald of Wales, in what can be considered a more typical example of this appeal from his *Expugnatio Hibernica*, has the Cambro-Norman leader FitzStephen addressing his soldiers:

> My comrades in other battles, picked fighting men, who have endured with me so many perils and have always displayed a spirit lofty and unconquered: if we consider carefully who we are, under what leader we serve, and with what a steady record of success we are entering upon this decisive struggle, we will win the day with our usual valour, and our good fortune in battle, with the favour she has shown of old, will not desert us.[34]

This oration goes on to attribute this tradition of victory at least in part to the lineal descent of the soldiers from Gallic and Trojan ancestors, whose martial virtues they have inherited by the laws of nature. Given the prominence of Gerald's own family in the Norman invasion of Ireland, this praise of the virtue and ancestry of the Cambro-Normans is unsurprising.

31 Bliese, 'The Courage of the Normans', p. 2.
32 Bliese, 'Aelred of Rievaulx's Rhetoric', p. 546.
33 Bliese, 'The Courage of the Normans', p. 4.
34 EH, pp. 47–8.

The form and true significance of this clear appeal to the 'tradition of victory' contrasts sharply with an example from the early thirteenth-century account of the fall of the kingdom of Jerusalem, the *Libellus de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum*. In this instance, the Master of the Military Order of the Knights Templar addresses both Templar and Hospitaller combatants prior to a disastrous defeat:

> My dearest brothers and fellow soldiers, you have always withstood these deceitful and fallen ones; you have exacted vengeance on them; you have always had victory over them. Therefore, gird yourselves, and stand firm in the Lord's battle, and remember your fathers, the Maccabees, whose duty of fighting for the Church, for the Law, [and] for the inheritance of the Crucified One you have now taken upon yourselves for a long time. But know that your fathers were victors everywhere not so much by numbers or in arms, as through faith, and justice, and observance of God's commands, since it is not difficult to triumph either with many [men] or few when victory is from heaven.[35]

The idea of the 'tradition of victory', instead of being understood as relying upon direct descent and innate qualities, is here employed by the author of the *Libellus* to very different ends. Rather than literal ancestors, the fathers (*patres*) of the Templars and Hospitallers are identified as the biblical Maccabees, who were victorious over their enemies by the power of God. This specific identification provides insight into the textual influences which likely impacted the author of the *Libellus*. The association of the Military Orders, specifically the Templars, with the Maccabees, features in the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux, amongst other prominent contemporary or near contemporary churchmen.[36] Moreover, this formulation of the motivational appeal to a tradition of victory relates to some of the central concerns of the narrative of the *Libellus* as a whole, specifically spiritual righteousness and the place of the divine in directing the course of historical events. Such a juxtaposition highlights the variety and versatility of even the most commonly recurring motivational appeals. This serves to display the need to contextualize these speeches properly in order to discern their meaning and significance within the wider narratives in which they are found. Furthermore, this approach can go a significant way towards reconciling what may appear to be divergent notions within battle rhetoric, such as appeals to fighting for Christ being found alongside promises of worldly wealth. This approach rejects an understanding of battle rhetoric as

35 LTS, pp. 114–5.

36 Miriam R. Terresa, 'The Use of the Bible in Twelfth-Century Papal Letters to Outremer', in *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources*, ed. by Elizabeth Lapina and Nicholas Morton (Leiden, 2017), pp. 197–9.

a form of medieval writing wherein the concerns and priorities of oration authors, usually clerics or monastics, were often suspended in order to display a 'pragmatic' representation of warfare.[37] Bliese also argued for the limited amount of *ethopoeia*, or character delineation, in battle rhetoric from the period 1000–1250, while this book will argue for the importance of contextualization regarding the presentation of individual speakers and specific audiences, not simply as a rhetorical tool but as essential to oration writing.[38]

Though recognizing the aforementioned typology, the major themes of speeches examined in this book are conceived more broadly in order to allow for analysis of the hortatory content in a more holistic fashion, rather than merely as set motivational appeals. Moreover, it challenges the understanding that battle orations consist of largely interchangeable motivational appeals or appeals that were simply believed to be most effective at encouraging soldiers to fight. Instead, it argues that the motivational appeals of battle rhetoric were more often than not selected in order to reinforce the wider themes and didactic messages of the narratives in which they are found.

David Bachrach has, in an examination of Christian battle speeches, made before encounters with Muslim enemies written between 1080 and 1170, highlighted the classical emphasis on utilizing material suitable (*aptum*) for one's rhetorical purposes. This principle necessitated that oration authors would be careful to fill their battle speeches with appropriate motivations to fight. That such material was recognizable to an audience familiar with warfare even at the expense of accurate detail was, supposedly, paramount.[39] According to Bachrach, this desire to write plausibly meant that while army commanders, as well as clerics, could deliver rousing speeches that included themes of divine power and aid, as well as faithfulness to God, oration authors changed their rhetorical strategies to suit the speech giver. Speeches given by secular commanders needed to be free from comparison, distinction and *exempla*, which were common tools of preaching, being presented as simple and to the point.[40] Chapter One explores the influence of classical rhetoric upon crusading battle rhetoric in detail and develops Bachrach's formulation of this notion.

Outside of the recurring rhetorical form of battle rhetoric, this book seeks to address in part the broader lacuna of scholarship that deals with direct speech in medieval historical writing. No doubt this omission in modern scholarship is due in part to the broad and diverse nature of the topic.

37 John R. E. Bliese, 'When Knightly Courage May Fail: Battle Orations in Medieval Europe', *The Historian*, 53: 3 (1991), p. 503.

38 Bliese, 'Aelred of Rievaulx's Rhetoric', p. 548.

39 Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility', pp. 2–4.

40 Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility', p. 17.

Where studies have been attempted, they have focused either on a single work, such as Alan Murray's examination of orality in the chronicle of Galbert of Bruges, or on a group of texts focused on similar subject matter.[41] However, forms, functions and content of direct speech, even in single texts are often greatly divergent and, as Murray has noted, the accuracy and purposes of different kinds of discourse varies considerably.[42] Hence, the work is restricted to a single, albeit widespread and broadly conceived, form of direct speech, through which it will seek to provide some insight into the phenomenon more widely.

In seeking to examine battle orations as inseparable elements of wider narratives, this study also builds upon a recent trend in medieval historiography, namely the move away from static conceptions of texts as data, in order to consider their dynamic function as literary works.[43] A comprehensive analysis of battle orations demands an appreciation of the influence, readership and shifting legacies of the narratives within which they are found, as opposed to approaching them simply as repositories of 'facts'. This is particularly appropriate in the case of the narrative accounts of the early crusading movement, which contributed significantly to the development of crusading ideals in western Europe, that were to hold a long and significant resonance.[44]

This work is, therefore, an empirical study of contextualized language, centred on the hortatory content that is the mainstay of battlefield orations. While much of the content of battle orations, I will argue, resists Bliese's narrow typology of rhetorical *topoi*, there are prominent preoccupations that recur through battle rhetoric in twelfth-century narratives.[45] This is unsurprising in part because of the very nature of battle rhetoric. As Elizabeth Keitel has argued and as David Bachrach has also discussed, only so many arguments would be plausible and compelling when ordering soldiers into battle.[46]

Centrally the study asks: what is the character and nature of battle rhetoric in twelfth-century crusade narratives? How does the hortatory

41 Alan V. Murray, 'Voices of Flanders: Orality and Constructed Orality in the Chronicle of Galbert of Bruges', *Handelingen der Maatschappij voor Geschiedenis en Oudheidkunde te Gent n.s.*, 48 (1994), pp. 103–119. Rasa Mažeika, 'Pagans, Saints, and War Criminals: Direct Speech as a Sign of Liminal Interchanges in Latin Chronicles of the Baltic Crusades', *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 45: 2 (2014), pp. 271–88.

42 Murray, 'Voices of Flanders', p. 109.

43 Damien Kempf, 'Towards a Textual Archaeology of the First Crusade', in *Writing the Early Crusades, Text, Transmission and Memory,* ed. by Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 116–7.

44 Kempf, 'Towards a Textual Archaeology of the First Crusade', p. 126.

45 Bliese, 'Rhetoric and Morale', pp. 205–17.

46 Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility', p. 3. Elizabeth Keitel, 'Homeric Antecedents to the *Cohortatio* in the Ancient Historians', *The Classical World,* 80 (1987), p. 171.

content compare with speeches in contemporary non-crusading accounts? How do the themes and preoccupations of battle orations develop over the course of the twelfth and early thirteenth century? More specifically to the study of crusading it asks what does textual comparison reveal about how chroniclers understood crusading in relation to 'secular' warfare? What do orations tell us of the place of spiritual reward in crusading and 'secular' warfare? To what extent do the emotive appeals employed by oration authors reflect the concerns of the clergy that preached crusading? What do these texts reveal about contemporary perceptions of courage and loyalty in war? Moreover, this work explores how battlefield orations developed as a distinct form of medieval writing in this period and seeks to better explain the interest in this form from writing from both clergy and the literate laity.

Defining Crusade Battle Rhetoric

This book is centrally concerned with the battle rhetoric found in the contemporary or near contemporary narrative sources which detail the military campaigns commonly identified as the First Crusade (1095–1099), the Second Crusade (1147–1149) and Third Crusade (1189–1192). More specifically, the foundational texts of this research are Latin prose narratives. Investigation of Latin poetic narratives concerned with these topics has been limited, in part due to the scope required for an extensive treatment of both prose and poetry, but also because the vocabulary of poetry is naturally subordinated to metre in a way that the vocabulary of prose is not.[47] While the central texts to this study will be discussed at greater length in subsequent chapters, this section will outline briefly the corpus which has been examined.[48]

Of the numerous Latin prose narratives produced in the first half of the twelfth century that detailed the First Crusade, ten contain battle orations. These are: the anonymous *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* of Peter Tudebode, the *Historia Belli Sacri,* the *Montecassino Chronicle*, the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Fulcher of Chartres, Baldric of Bourgueil's *Historia Iherosolimitana*,[49] Guibert of Nogent's *Dei Gesta per Francos*, Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolimitana*, Ralph of Caen's *Gesta Tancredi de Expeditione Jerosolimitana* and Albert of Aachen *Historia Iherosolimitana*. In addition to these narratives, the chroniclers Orderic Vitalis and Henry of Huntingdon

47 Conor Kostick, *The Social Structure of the First Crusade* (Leiden, 2008), p. 4.

48 Full bibliographical references for this corpus are given in the Bibliography as well as Abbreviations.

49 BB. An English translation of Baldric's *Historia* by Sue Edgington is forthcoming, and I would like to thank Dr. Edgington for allowing me to consult the unpublished translation. Unless otherwise stated translations from BB are my own.

also employ rhetorical orations before battle in the sections of their works which detail the events of the First Crusade.

The failure of the Second Crusade in part accounts for the comparative lack of interest it received by western authors of historical narratives and thus prefigures a nadir in the production of crusading battle rhetoric. Odo of Deuil's *De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem,* for example, contains no such material. This is despite the fact that Odo does make use of direct speech that shares some common elements of battle rhetoric, such as the discussion of virtue. The account also includes descriptions of Louis's personal heroics at the Battle of Mount Cadmus (1148).[50] However, valuable material for this study is to be found in the epistolary narrative *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi.* This text details a combined Anglo-Norman, Flemish and German expedition to the Holy Land that was diverted from its objective in order to take part in the Portuguese campaign that ultimately captured Lisbon in 1147. Although writing around several decades after the events of the Second Crusade and the authorship of the *De expugnatione*, Helmold of Bosau's *Chronica Sclavorum* also contains battle rhetoric which supposedly took place during the military campaigns against Polabian Slavs in modern eastern Germany, in 1147. In the second half of the twelfth century, the great chronicler of the Latin East, William of Tyre, included an account of the First Crusade in his *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*. This account, as well descriptions of battle elsewhere in the text, employs battle orations, although usually through indirect speech (*oratio obliqua*).

A greater number of accounts detailing the Third Crusade utilize battle rhetoric. Many of these narratives have been established to be, or are suspected to be, English in origin. These include Richard of Devizes *Chronicon de rebus gestis Ricardi Primi*, Roger of Hoveden's *Chronica*, the *Libellus de Expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum*, the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi* and Ralph of Coggeshall's *Chronicon Anglicanum*. However, there are two contemporary German narratives which contain battle rhetoric that supposedly took place in the crusader attack on Iconium in 1190. These are commonly known as the *Historia de expeditione Friderici I imperatoris*, traditionally attributed to one 'Ansbert', as well as the *Historia Peregrinorum*.

In terms of their battle orations, these narratives will be analyzed systematically both against each other and alongside a wide body of non-crusading texts, or texts where orations occur outside of the circumstances of crusading, which contain battle rhetoric, written from the mid-eleventh to early thirteenth centuries. This corpus incorporates work originating in the British Isles, northern and southern France, southern Italy, Germany as well as the Crusader States.

50 Odo of Deuil, *De Profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem: The Journey of Louis VII to the East*, ed. and trans. by Virginia G. Berry (New York, NY, 1948), pp. 26, 116–9.

This book is structured into five chapters. Chapter One seeks to establish and properly contextualize the phenomenon of battle rhetoric within the western tradition of narrative history writing, with particular reference to the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In exploring the place of 'rhetoric' within pre-battle orations, this chapter considers a number of different influences upon the crafting of persuasive speech in medieval historical writing. Such influences notably include the classical *ars rhetorica*, a tradition which, as well as imparting lessons on the suitable forms of rhetoric which were to be deployed for particular purposes, also emphasized the need for rhetoricians to consider what rhetorical material would be most appropriate for their audiences, as well as demanding, that invented material possess qualities of plausibility and verisimilitude. This classical influence was both direct, being transmitted to medieval authors often through popular rhetorical manuals, particularly those of Cicero, Quintilian and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, as well as being indirectly filtered through the writings of the Church Fathers and early Christian writers. Also considered is the impact of the education of oration authors, particularly in regard to the words of Scripture. Lastly, in attempting to address the proliferation of battle rhetoric in the twelfth century, this chapter considers what in a broad sense the audience and purpose of battle orations could be, emphasizing in particular their moral and didactic messages and evident deployment as *exempla*.

Chapters Two and Three focus on the battle rhetoric of the contemporary or near contemporary accounts of the campaigns of the First Crusade, which would have a clear influence upon the writing of battle rhetoric throughout the remainder of the twelfth century. Chapter Two is centred on a single text, the *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, examining how battle rhetoric is employed in that text in comparison with orations from a small number of eleventh-century historical narratives. It will establish the more prominent themes and motivational appeals of the *Gesta* and contextualize them within the framework of the early crusading movement. Chapter Three expands upon the findings of Chapter Two, in examining battle rhetoric from other narratives of the First Crusade. It will demonstrate how the themes and motivational appeals found in the *Gesta* were developed in the battle rhetoric of these later authors, as well as the influence of ecclesiastical ideas concerning proper behaviour in warfare, arguing that battle rhetoric formed part of a broader explanatory framework that was acutely concerned with the spiritual status and behaviour of combatants. In conjunction with Chapter Two, this chapter will also argue that far from being merely rhetorical ornamentation, battle rhetoric was a popular and versatile rhetorical tool that allowed oration authors to reinforce or present important themes or ideas in their wider narratives in a forceful way through direct speech at climactic moments.

Chapters Four and Five then move on to consider the phenomenon of battle rhetoric throughout the remainder of the twelfth century and into the thirteenth century. Retaining a focus on crusading and holy war, both

chapters take a single rhetorically rich narrative as a starting point, from which they explore the variance of battle rhetoric, the development of particular themes or motivational appeals as well as the impact of circumstance, character delineation and audience upon battle orations. Chapter Four focuses upon the *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, in comparison with crusading and non-crusading orations written between 1145 and 1187, in order to display how the text seeks to justify the expedition and model a form of holy war centred on unity and right intention. Moreover, this chapter highlights the increase in importance of appeals concerned with authority and the justice of a conflict in an era when warfare became the subject of work by canon lawyers. Chapter Five, centred on the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Richardi*, argues that due to the influence of the fall of Jerusalem in 1187, as well as the ongoing lack of success in the Holy Land in the early thirteenth century, a shift in the conception of holy war is perceptible through contemporary battle rhetoric. Notably, *Itinerarium*'s use of appeals to martial virtues, as well as its presentation of divine aid, serves to set this work apart markedly from earlier orations and frame crusading as being performed not centrally as penitential devotion but as heroic, if ultimately unsuccessful, military service to Christ.

1 The Battle Oration and Classical Rhetoric

Introduction

In spite of its problematic status as a pagan discipline in a Christianizing empire, Roman rhetoric underwent considerable Christianization and promotion at the hands of certain churchmen, particularly Augustine of Hippo (354–430 AD). It subsequently found its way into medieval preaching, legal systems and education as part of the seven liberal arts.[1] Rhetoric has been understood and approached by modernists as 'style',[2] and a great deal of scholarship concerned with rhetoric has concentrated on the recognition of prescribed tropes and figures of speech, identified and explored in both classical and medieval texts.[3] Many of these rhetorical devices were utilized by medieval oration authors. *Adnominatio*, which involved the manipulation of the letters in a particular word, discussed in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium,* was for example utilized by Henry of Huntingdon and Gerald of Wales.[4] Similarly, a clear example of *paradystole* or *distinctio*,[5] the reassessment of a virtue as a vice (or the inverse), can be found in Walter Espec's speech in Aelred of Rievaulx's *Relatio de Standardo* when the English soldiers are told that the fierceness of their Scottish opponents does not come from true courage, but out of an irrational contempt for death.[6]

Of greater significance to the examination of battle rhetoric is the broader conception of rhetoric as the art of good speech- speaking well (*bene*)- as

1 John R. E. Bliese, 'The Study of Rhetoric in the Twelfth Century', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 63:4 (1977), pp. 364–5. James J. Murphy, 'Saint Augustine and the Debate about a Christian Rhetoric', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 46:4 (1960), pp. 400–10.

2 Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History*, pp. 6–7.

3 RAH, p. 257, 333. IO, iii, pp. 301–3, 349–55. Daniel D. McGarry (trans.), *The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury: A Twelfth-Century Defense of the Verbal and Logical Arts of the Trivium* (Berkley, CA, 1955), p. 54, 56.

4 HH p. 447. EH, p. 161.

5 RAH, pp. 167–9, 317. IO, iii, p. 483.

6 RS, p. 186.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003044611-2

opposed to speaking correctly (*recte*), which was the realm of grammar.[7] By this definition, good speech was persuasive speech, usually encountered in the situation of words wielded by a successful orator. The power of persuasion lay at the heart of battle rhetoric. It underscored the conceit of medieval *oratio obliqua*, instances wherein rousing exhortations are simply described in the third-person. It also highlights the importance of *oratio recta* battle rhetoric, that is hortatory direct speech aimed at the audience of the oration within the narrative and more explicitly at those who would read or listen to said narrative.

The influence of classical rhetorical teaching, as well as that of classical and biblical texts as models for oration authors, is the subject of this chapter. The significance of rhetoric in shaping the content of historical narratives,[8] as well as signposting how authors wanted their work to be interpreted,[9] necessitates that this chapter discuss what the use of rhetoric by oration authors can tell us about the purpose of this recurring rhetorical form and how authors intended such speeches to be received and understood. This will involve an examination of the 'truthfulness' of battle orations, from the perspective of classical and medieval rhetoric. This chapter will argue that battle orations were rhetorical inventions influenced, though not prescribed, by classical and biblical language, presented as part of a tradition of historical writing that demanded plausibility and verisimilitude. Yet these rules could be bent and broken so that battle rhetoric could present particular themes or moral and didactic lessons vital to the narrative concerned, at climactic moments through direct speech. Moreover, this chapter will emphasize the importance of the context in which these texts were produced, a literary landscape subject to the influences of monasticism, church reform and the crusading movement.

Principles of Classical Rhetoric and their Medieval Development

While the proliferation of narrative history writing in the early twelfth century was provoked in part by the advent of the crusading movement, this

7 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 8. Harry M. Hubbell (trans.), *Cicero, On Invention. The Best Kind of Orator. Topics*., (Cambridge, MA, 1949), pp. 13–5, 97. IO, i, pp. 301–3, iii, pp. 85–7.

8 Morse, *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages*. Richard W. Southern, 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing: I – The Classical Tradition from Einhard to Geoffrey of Monmouth', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 20 (1970), pp. 173–96.

9 Gerda Heydemann, 'The Orator as Exegete: Cassiodorus as a Reader of the Psalms', in *Reading the Bible in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Jinty Nelson and Damien Kempf (London, 2015), p. 22.

phenomenon was just one aspect of a broader rise in the production and study of history in this period.[10] Although it is impossible to describe the writing of history in a single formulation, among the most significant influences on medieval historiography was that of classical rhetoric.[11] In regard to battle rhetoric this classical influence did not involve medieval authors simply copying classical examples.[12] The importance of classical influences on the writing of battle rhetoric is at once more encompassing, pervasive and nuanced.

The writing of history, lacking its own field of study, curriculum and educational programme, was a subsidiary subject, subsumed into the *trivium*.[13] William of Newburgh famously highlighted the position of history writing as a 'secondary' activity when he explained that taking part in such a task during a period of prolonged illness would be refreshing and far easier than the mentally taxing work of engaging with the mysteries of theology.[14] Without its own systematic guidelines, the basic rules of history writing were those common to the entirety of the art of language. Throughout the medieval period these rules were to be found in the classical rhetorical manuals that had come down to that age, sometimes fragmentally and often through mediation. Central were two works of Cicero *De Inventione, c.* 89 BC and *De Oratore*, *c.* 55 BC. Beyond Cicero is a manual that was long attributed to his authorship, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, *c.* 86–82 BC as well as Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, *c.* 86–95 AD.[15] However, even in regard to these foundational texts, there has been considerable debate over their precedence and utility.[16]

10 John O. Ward, 'Some Principles of Rhetorical Historiography in the Twelfth Century', in *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography*, p. 103.

11 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 3, 34.

12 Cf. Foreville, *Histoire de Guillaume le Conquérant*, p. xxxix, 184 n. 1. Smalley, *Historians in the Middle Ages*, p. 20.

13 Smalley, *Historians in the Middle Ages*, p. 18. Lars B. Mortensen, 'The Glorious Past: Entertainment, Example or History? Levels of Twelfth- Century Historical Culture', *Culture and History*, 13 (1994), p. 66. John O. Ward, 'Classical Rhetoric and the Writing of History in Medieval and Renaissance Culture', in *European History and Its Historians*, ed. by Frank McGregor and Nicholas Wright (Adelaide, 1977), pp. 1–10.

14 Peter G. Walsh and Michael J. Kennedy (eds.), *William of Newburgh: The History of English Affairs, Book 1* (Warminster, 1988), pp. 26–7.

15 Reynolds, *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 98–112, 332–4.

16 Bliese, 'The Study of Rhetoric', pp. 365–6. Hastings Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages: Volume 1: Salerno*, *Bologna, Paris*, ed. by Frederick M. Powicke and Alfred B. Emden (Oxford, 1936), p. 35. Priscila S. Boskoff, 'Quintilian in the Late Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 27 (1952), p. 77. James J. Murphy, 'Cicero's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 53 (1967), p. 336. James J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (London, 1981), p. 111.

The fundamental aims of rhetoric were to teach (*docere*), to move (*movere*) and to please (*delectare*). Each goal required different methods.[17] In teaching truths, rhetoric was part of dialectic, yet truth required rhetoric in order to appear true.[18] Like truth, rhetoric was thought to also give force to virtuous and moral behaviour by its ability to stir emotions, as Cicero asked: 'Who more passionately than the orator can encourage [others] to virtuous conduct, or more zealously reclaim [them] from vice? Who can more austerely censure the wicked or more gracefully praise men of worth?'.[19] The connection between history, rhetoric and ethics was commented on by Beryl Smalley, who described the history of historiography as a long attempt by history to separate itself from these sister disciplines.[20] These siblings were, as Smalley noted, welded together in the writings of Sallust, who prefaced his most famous works *De coniuratione Catilinae* and *Bellum Iugurthinum*, with praise for the pursuit of virtue and explanations of the consequences of the degradation of morality he saw as having taken hold in Rome.[21] Quintilian's own manual also reinforced this notion. Because the scope of rhetoric was so broad as to be practically unlimited, dealing as it did with every aspect of human life which could conceivably be the subject of speech, it was an ultimately philosophical and ethical, rather than purely practical discipline. This meant that the perfect rhetorician was a wise and morally virtuous individual.[22] Despite the hostility to pagan learning in the fourth century, this notion survived on into the Christian world, being espoused in the eighth century by Alcuin of York.[23]

What did not survive were the traditional arenas in which rhetoric was practised, those being the Roman law courts and forums of politics, leaving history among its few remaining outlets. These origins further emphasize the importance of speeches[24] in regard to rhetoric and highlight in the field of twelfth-century historical writing a not inconsiderable lacuna in the topic of direct speech in historical narratives.[25] Rhetorical tools were classified with reference to their vocational origins. These division were demonstrative (or epideictic) rhetoric, which sought to praise or blame, legal or judicial rhetoric, the rhetoric of the law courts and deliberative rhetoric, which seeks to persuade the audience to undertake a particular course of action. The

17 IO, i, p. 397. Elenore Stump (trans.), *Boethius's De topicis differentiis* (Ithaca, NY, 1978), p. 83, 87.

18 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 350.

19 Hubbell, *Cicero, On Invention*, p. 223. Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 9.

20 Beryl Smalley, 'Sallust in the Middle Ages', in *Classical Influence on European Culture AD 500–1500*, ed. by Robert R. Bolgar (Cambridge, 1971), p. 175.

21 Reynolds, *C. Sallusti Crispi*, pp. 5–13, 54–7.

22 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 10. IO, ii, pp. 357–9, 365, iii, 179.

23 Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*, pp. 80–1.

24 Nancy F. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (London, 1997), p. 27.

25 Southern, 'Einhard to Geoffrey of Monmouth', p. 181.

most straightforward of these, with obvious relevance to battle rhetoric, is demonstrative rhetoric. With reference to its positive formation, as opposed to its use to castigate, demonstrative rhetoric seeks to praise an individual or group, in order to maintain or aggrandize their reputation (*fama*), so they will be recognized in the present and remembered in the future. The deployment of such praise was understood to require a robust knowledge of virtue and vice, being able to distinguish as Quintilian put it, between things that are morally worthy (*honesta*) from things which are morally reprehensible (*turpia*).[26] That this knowledge was crucial to the production of material which properly praised good men is evidenced by the listed summaries of virtues and their corresponding vices in works such as Cicero's *De Inventione,* with such sections often being transmitted on their own.[27]

The recognition and praise of virtue naturally constitutes a significant portion of the hortatory content of battle orations. Moreover, the purpose of demonstrative rhetoric, to praise past virtue in order to inspire future virtue, resonates strongly with medieval battle rhetoric, wherein calls to recall the deeds and virtues of ancestors are not infrequent.[28] Furthermore, that the praise of past generations carried with it an implicit criticism of contemporaries, who may not have been able to live up to the example of their forefathers, would find particularly fertile ground in the generations following the success of the First Crusade. In an instance of direct speech delivered by one of the central characters of the account of the capture of Lisbon in 1147, *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, the Anglo-Norman leader Hervey of Glainville invoked this notion directly in a simple dichotomy. Either the crusaders would show themselves to be worthy emulators of their ancestors, a path to glory and honour, or they would face disgrace for their failure.[29]

Outside of a crusading context, classical ideas of demonstrative rhetoric were central to numerous texts which provided models for oration authors and instances of historical figures, from among the laity as well as the clergy, whose deeds and virtues could be emulated. The widely influential *vita* of St. Martin of Tours by Sulpicius Severus is a notable example. Sulpicius opened his work by contrasting classical notions of the immortality of fame with Christian eternal life, yet nevertheless concedes the benefits of writing about 'great men' in order to stir a desire for others to emulate such people. The example of St. Martin is of course also meant to stir its audience to virtues, specifically those of wisdom and a desire to serve heaven.[30] The *vita*

26 IO, i, p. 353, iv, p. 391. Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 138.

27 Hubbell, *Cicero, On Invention*, pp. 327–33. Boniface Ramsay (trans.), *Responses to Miscellaneous Questions: Part I- Books, Volume 12*, (New York, 2008), pp. 45–7.

28 Bliese, 'Courage of the Normans', pp. 4, 10–11. Bliese, 'Rhetoric and Morale', pp. 212–13.

29 DEL, p. 281.

30 See White's commentary in Carolinne White, *Early Christian Lives* (Harmondsworth, 1998) pp. 1–2, 135–6.

of St. Martin certainly appears to have influenced one historical narrative that features the longest and most rhetorically rich extant instance of battle rhetoric in the twelfth century, Aelred of Rievaulx's *Relatio de Standardo*. This is most obvious in the closing moments of the story of the Scottish invasion of England in 1138, with a defeated Prince Henry of Scotland offering his breastplate to a beggar.[31]

However, given the obviously bellicose nature of battle rhetoric, perhaps more important to its flourishing in the twelfth century was the influence of *vitae* of laymen whose military careers were central to their legacy. Notable here for its subject matter as well as for the number of surviving manuscripts is Einhard's *vita Karoli* which, like Severus' work, begins with a justification for writing that carries strong echoes of the earlier work. Einhard's preface, which he insists is below the required 'Ciceronian eloquence'[32] of the subject matter, nevertheless advances notions which would shape a great deal of subsequent historiography including the problem of forgetting great men and their deeds, the importance of fame and glory and the imitation of virtue as well as its commemoration for posterity.[33] That these same themes could be used to inform the writing of histories with a greater scope than a single character was displayed by the influential *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* of the Venerable Bede. Like Einhard, Bede's prologue stresses the didactic nature of his work:

> Should history tell of good men and their good estate, the thoughtful listener is spurred on to imitate the good; should it record the evil ends of wicked men, no less effectually the devout and earnest listener or reader is kindled to eschew what is harmful and perverse, and himself with greater care pursue those things which he has learned to be good and pleasing in the sight of God.[34]

Dedicating his work to Ceolwulf, king of Northumbria, Bede lays heavy emphasis on the virtuous and pious Oswald of Northumbria, and records an oration which the saintly king supposedly delivered before battle against the pagan Caedwalla that reinforces this didacticism; 'Let us kneel together and pray to the almighty, everlasting and true God to defend us in His mercy from the proud and fierce enemy; for he knows that we are fighting for a just cause and for the preservation of our whole race'.[35]

31 RS, p. 198.

32 Paul Edward Dutton (ed.), *Charlemagne's Courtier: The Complete Einhard* (Ontario, 1998), pp. 15–16.

33 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 159.

34 Bertram Colgrave and Roger A. B. Mynors (eds.), *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969), p. 3.

35 Colgrave and Mynors, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, pp. 214–15.

It is difficult to underestimate the influence of these works, especially during the proliferation of history writing in the twelfth century, which display the importance of the tradition of demonstrative rhetoric in medieval historiography. That this tradition was clearly heavily involved in the production of battle orations is evidenced by the number of these speeches which address issues such as virtue, honour and glory as well as faith and moral behaviour. Additionally, beyond the praise of virtue, battle rhetoric down to and beyond the twelfth century often dealt with the other side of demonstrative rhetoric, the castigation of vice. In medieval historiography the principles of this aspect of demonstrative rhetoric were bound up with Christian spirituality by Gildas. His work of *c.* 540 *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*, in the manner of an Old Testament denunciation, argued that the sins of the rulers of Britain were the cause of the calamities which fell upon their kingdoms.[36] That one such scourge (*plaga*) upon a people, inflicted by God because of their sins, could be defeat and subjugation by foreigners was recognized by Thietmar of Merseburg in the early eleventh century, and Henry of Huntingdon in the twelfth.[37] Through the medium of battle rhetoric, this macro view of human history could be transposed to the micro level of the battlefield where virtue both moral and martial, righteousness and sin convened with or against fortune and providence. While the lesson imparted by these orations is usually one of ultimate success, like Gildas' 'tearful history', there are in the twelfth century examples of the inclusion of battle orations prior to significant defeats. This phenomenon is all the more striking in a medieval context because of the relative lack of paired speeches (delivered by opposing commanders to their own soldiers), compared to classical examples. Outside of the handful of medieval instances however, battle orations are usually positioned at the climax or culmination of hardships which will be successfully confronted.

The influence of deliberative rhetoric, arguing for or against a course of action, is perhaps less obvious when examining battle rhetoric. Although few orations deal with overtly political matters, and never involve the presentation of alternate courses of action, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* describes the primary goal of deliberative rhetoric to be to advise what is useful and advantageous.[38] While the purpose of this rhetoric was to secure advantages, with clear utility (*utilitas*) ranging from virtue, wealth or allies,[39] the greatest concern was to identify the course of action that was morally worthy followed by what would bring security. However, Cicero makes clear that beyond immediate considerations of necessity and circumstance, those

36 Michael Winterbottom (ed.), *Gildas*, *The Ruin of Britain and other works*, (Chichester, 1978), pp. 40–45.

37 David A. Warner, *Ottonian Germany: The Chronicon of Thietmar of Merseburg* (Manchester, 2001), pp. 66–7. HH, pp. lvii–lxvi.

38 RAH, p. 157, 161.

39 Hubbell, *Cicero, On Invention*, pp. 325–7.

actions which are morally worthy will more often than not bring security, while actions which bring security, though intrinsically inferior to morally worthy actions, will allow for such actions in the future.[40] An illustrative example of the importance of these ideas to medieval historiography is to be found in the prologue of Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* where deliberative and demonstrative ideas are set side by side to reinforce the moral-didactic nature of his work and argue for the advantages history has over philosophy when it came to teaching ethics.[41] Similarly, in his *Topographica Hibernica* Gerald of Wales quotes Virgil excusing Aeneas' use of deception in warfare, 'who asks of an enemy whether he employs guile or virtue?'[42] Arguing that expedience is often considered better than honour, yet he almost immediately adds in the fashion of Cicero that only what is honourable can be said to be truly expedient.[43] A rhetorical tradition which permitted the absence of a totally impermeable dichotomy between the praise of high ideals and expedient necessity helps reconcile examples of battle orations, particularly in crusading accounts which were highly concerned with the spiritual status of those involved, wherein insistence on the righteousness of the cause being fought for and calls for divine aid are set alongside arguments of necessity.

That such arguments from necessity appear with such frequency,[44] though often as a coda to otherwise ideological orations, poses a challenge to the interpretation of battle rhetoric. An example from the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Lisiard of Tours, from a battle oration supposedly delivered by Baldwin I during the first Battle of Ramla on 7 September 1101, displays well the discordant notions often advanced:

> You who are going to fight for the Lord, be strong in the Lord, and in the strength of his might (*virtutis*). Almighty God is able to save you: Always recall his sweet promises and fix them in your mind, by which your scarcity and poverty he most benevolently strengthens, saying: Do not be afraid, little flock, for it hath pleased your Father to give you the kingdom.[45] If we should think only of the king of the earthly realm, or of wages or gifts, we should deservedly tremble, fearing either to be conquered or to die. For a person about to fight, it should appear preferable to die, a person who knows that an eternal kingdom has been

40 Hubbell, *Cicero, On Invention*, p. 241, 337. Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 233.

41 HH, p. 3.

42 Henry R. Fairclough (trans.), *Virgil. Vol. II: Aeneid 7-12; Appendix Vergiliana* (Cambridge, MA, 2000), p. 321.

43 John S. Brewer, James F. Dimock and George F. Warner (eds.), *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera,* 8 vols (London, 1861–91), v, p. 166. John J. O'Meara (trans.), *The History and Topography of Ireland* (Harmondsworth, 1982) p. 107, 109.

44 Bliese, 'Courage of the Normans', p. 18.

45 Luke 12:32.

> prepared for him when he dies by the eternal king. Whether he dies in this battle, this time or should we escape, we should have no doubt of victory. If we seem to the ungodly and foolish to be defeated, dying in their presence, coming to Christ our joy, we triumph better over the devil and over the world. If, however, as our Christ has frequently done, he wishes to save our bodies here and to provide victory over these enemies, we shall in fact be less glorious than if we die: but nevertheless, we will obtain a great name, beyond the name of the great who are still on the earth, for ourselves, which Christ our lord will give to us. No one should think of flight, because we are too far away from our Francia.[46]

The lessons of deliberative rhetoric address the sense of cognitive dissonance resulting from this juxtaposition. Far from monks and clerics unashamedly presenting the 'real' motivations of medieval warriors, removed from any sense theology or legality of warfare,[47] the rhetorical training of medieval authors aided them in setting the ultimately profound and powerful spiritual advantages of battle alongside harsh but expedient necessities, which arguably was thought to include promises of material wealth. Moreover, the contrasting of crusading and non-crusading orations in subsequent chapters will display how many examples of twelfth-century battle rhetoric reflect the flexibility to circumstance expected of deliberative rhetoric in the medieval world. That the deployment of rhetorical arguments depended greatly on understanding the circumstances in which they were to be utilized, in order that the rhetoric was appropriate (*apta*), was central to *inventio,* that is the 'discovery' or construction of arguments which serve to make the text convincing.[48]

Argument, according to Cicero, was a principle or reason which establishes faith (*fides*) in something otherwise in doubt.[49] The presentation of these arguments, including their arrangements (*dispositio*), was required to ensure the rhetoric was moving. This could also permit the inclusion of 'made up' narrative (*ficta narratio*). Narrative for Quintilian was, similarly, 'the exposition of something which has been done, or as if it had been done, in a way which is advantageous to the goal of persuasion'.[50] This principle allowed for 'making things up' in order to evoke the emotions desired by the rhetorician within his audience. Beyond writing clearly, the power to evoke the desired response required the placing of an event 'before one's eyes' (*sub oculos subiectio*). This was not meant to present what had been done (*res gesta*),

46 LTC, 1603.

47 John R. E. Bliese, 'The Just War as Concept and Motive in the Central Middle Ages', in *Medievalia Et Humanistica: Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Culture, New Series – Number 17*, ed. by Paul Maurice Clogan (Savage, MD, 1991), pp. 11–13.

48 RAH, p. 187.

49 Hubbell, *Cicero, On Invention*, p. 387.

50 IO, iv, pp. 59–61, 67.

but displays how it might have been done (*ut res gesta*) in full detail.[51] The idea of history being set out before one's eyes either through physical depiction or vivid 'made up' description is certainly present in the twelfth century. William of Malmesbury describes the writing of Eadmer as depicting events so vividly 'that they seem, as it were, to have been placed before our eyes'.[52] Sallust commonly prefaced particularly vivid sections of his narrative by saying 'you would have seen …' (*cerneres*).[53] This technique was also employed by authors such as Guibert of Nogent.[54] Furthermore, a similar figure of speech is used by Aelred of Rievaulx in Walter Espec's battle oration; 'we have seen, we have seen with our own eyes …'[55]

Quintilian sets out that forming or 'making up' (*ficta*) involved both true and false constructions of events which both happened or might have happened in the past. While belief in a narrative (*fides*) derived from the authority of the narrator, it can nevertheless be appropriate to invent events according to what is true. Being manifest before the eyes of an audience, and possessing the similitude of truth, if they are indeed verisimilar, they will present the truth.[56] Building upon Cicero's tripartite model of history, narrative and fable, later writers such as Capella and Priscian refer to the idea of *argumentum* in Quintilian's approach to judicial rhetoric, which advances the presentation of events which were done or could be believed to have been done, not as *argumentum* but as *fictio*.[57] This understanding of *argumentum* or *fictio* was still accepted in the twelfth century, with the Parisian philosopher Thierry of Chartres defining *argumentum* as 'the argument of something made up and verisimilar' in his commentary on *De Inventione*.[58] *Fictio*, that is argument (as well as history), was concordantly meant to be understood as being distinct from fable or 'poetic fiction', which could never have actually happened.[59]

One of the most obvious and prolific examples of the application of this 'rhetorical fiction' is of course *sermocinatio*, the invented speech given to a character in language appropriate to their character and standing.[60] This

51 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, pp. 332–3.

52 Michael Winterbottom (ed.) and Rodney M. Thomson, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum: The History of the English Bishops, Vol. 1: Text and Translation* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 108–9.

53 Sallust, *C. Sallusti*, p. 52.

54 GN, p. 153, 297.

55 Vidimus, vidimus oculis nostris … RS, p. 186. Marsha L. Dutton (ed.), *Aelred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works*, trans. Jane Patricia Freeland (Kalamazoo, MI, 2005), p. 253.

56 IO, ii, pp. 117–9, iii, pp. 249–51, 358.

57 William Harris Stahl, Richard Johnson and Evan L. Burge (trans.), *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts: Volume II, The Marriage of Philology and Mercury* (New York, 1977), p. 207.

58 Karin Margareta Fredborg (ed.), *The Latin Rhetorical Commentaries by Thierry of Chartres* (Toronto, 1988), pp. 122–3.

59 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, pp. 338.

60 RAH, p. 367, 395, 399.

sort of invention could involve not only the words being said but the character expressing them, and their usefulness for historians as well as poets was actively recognized by authors from the classical world to the thirteenth century, as the work of Geoffrey of Vinsauf demonstrates.[61] The tolerance of falsehoods in invented speech, and in the writing of historical rhetoric in a wider sense, had to be checked by rhetoricians who were morally worthy individuals with virtuous goals in mind.[62] While lies which were meant to deceive (*mendacium*) were understood as different from the verisimilar way in which history, as with all other human affairs, was written about,[63] classical manuals never presented a clear dichotomy between truth and falsehood, 'history' and 'fiction'.[64] It was within this middle ground of plausible invention that battle rhetoric should be understood as residing. Additionally, that these rhetorical manuals stressed the identification of one's audience in order to craft appropriate rhetoric,[65] and on crafting truthful, that is probable, credible verisimilar narratives, necessitates further discussion of the audience and truthfulness of battle rhetoric in the later text.

While the influence of rhetorical manuals is evident in the principles imparted to authors down to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it is important to recognize the development of the principles and study of rhetoric over the course of the medieval period down to the twelfth century. This teaching was bound up with medieval education in the production of battle rhetoric, being present alongside the crucial influence of Scripture and those authors whose works mediated the teachings of the Bible. Such development markedly began with the work of Augustine and presents a development of many of the ideas of classical rhetorical manuals, particularly regarding the aforementioned unclear boundaries between truth and rhetoric.

Within a classical understanding, truth was thought to require rhetoric to make it seem truthful, because it was only through emotional rhetoric and stylistic eloquence that people could be convinced to act together in the common good, for example by shoring up the willingness of soldiers to fight and die in defence of their people.[66] The epistemological scepticism of Cicero known in the medieval world through his *Academica* held that truth, which came from natural law, could never really be known and that the sublunary world contained only appearances of truth. History, according to Matthew Kempshall, was distinguished from poetry because it aimed at the

61 Jane Baltzell Kopp (trans.), 'Geoffrey of Vinsauf: The New Poetics (c.1210 A.D.)' in *Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts*, ed. by James J. Murphy (Berkley, 1971), pp. 39–43.

62 IO, iv, p. 355.

63 Roger Ray, 'Rhetorical Scepticism and Verisimilar Narrative in John of Salisbury's *Historia Pontificalis*', in *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography*, p. 95.

64 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 349.

65 IO, iv, p. 159. H. M. Hubbell and G. L. Hendrickson (trans.), *Brutus, Orator* (Cambridge, MA, 1962), pp. xxxv, 397–9. Heydemann, 'The Orator as Exegete', p. 24.

66 Hubbell, *Cicero, On Invention*, pp. 5–7.

truth, while rhetoric was only concerned with what was like the truth.[67] However, this distinction between history and poetry was far from universal in either the classical or medieval world. Ancient poets such as Horace claimed for their discipline parallel attributes that Cicero had claimed for rhetoric, and thus history.[68] This blurring of verisimilitude and fable, history and poetry centred on continuing questions regarding truth; *quid est veritas*?[69] Bede notably included verse in his *Historia*, and pointed to the verse elements of the Book of Job.[70] Moreover, these questions were by no means resolved by the twelfth century, as is evidenced by the frequent intervention of poetry in medieval historiography. Henry of Huntingdon in the prologue of the *Historia Anglorum* called Homer a historian and claimed history and poetry shared the same didactic goals.[71]

However, the Ciceronian understanding of truth underwent severe scrutiny in the writings of Augustine, for whom securing the place of a historical understanding of Scripture, in particular of the New Testament, was crucial. Debating with Jerome on his interpretation of Galatians, in which Jerome highlighted the verisimilitude of the events of Galatians 2:11–12, Augustine feared that the presence of verisimilitude could undermine the 'sacred history' of the Book of Acts and the truth which should influence and characterize the life of Christians.[72] However, as many of the aforementioned medieval examples display, not everything which was 'made up' was, for Augustine and those his ideas influenced, a lie. Augustine even accepted that lies were present in certain instances within the Bible. However, where these lies are present they carried figurative truths. This distinction was necessary so as not to render all parables lies.[73]

Whereas for Cicero, distinctions between falsehoods can be drawn by their purposes, good or bad, historical truth for Augustine remained in the events of history (*res*), from which could come both literal and figurative truth depending on signification.[74] In a post-lapsarian world where the enjoyment of direct knowledge, in particular knowledge of God, was hampered by sin, mankind could only harness indirect knowledge through the interpretation of signs and symbols in order to access what Augustine called

67 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, pp. 355–7.

68 Henry R. Fairclough (trans.), *Horace; Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929), p. 479.

69 John 18:38.

70 Colgrave and Mynors, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, p. 205.

71 HH, pp. 3–9.

72 Henry Bettenson (trans.), *The City of God*, by Saint Augustine (Harmondsworth, 1984), p. 645, 648.

73 Henry Brown (trans.), *Seventeen Short Treatises of S. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo* (Oxford, 1847), pp. 447–50.

74 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, pp. 383–8.

'veiled secrets'.[75] However, for all this theoretical complexity and suspicion of rhetoric, which was certainly far from ignored by authors of battle rhetoric, Augustine's work retained an evident acceptance of the utility of rhetoric for Christians. Beyond its truthfulness, historical narratives for Augustine needed to be trustworthy and useful.[76] Moreover, that rhetoric in historical writing could be put to explicitly Christian use through *exempla* and narratives with clear moral and didactic purposes, is evident in both *Confessiones* and *De ciuitate Dei*.[77] Augustine's combination of classical rhetoric and scriptural exegesis is echoed in, to select only one example, *Dei Gesta Per Francos*. Therein, Guibert sought to marry rhetorical eloquence fitting for such vaunted subject matter, with something which was akin to Scripture in its levels of complexity and interpretation.[78]

Textual Influences on Medieval Rhetorical Writing

The indirect influence of Scripture was mediated through the writings of the Church Fathers, particularly Augustine but also notably Orosius, Eusebius,[79] Cassiodorus and Gregory the Great. Moreover, a number of Carolingian authors formed much of the foundation of medieval education in monastic and cathedral schools.[80] Yet the text of the Bible also directly influenced the production of twelfth-century battle rhetoric on several levels. The Bible was fundamental to how medieval authors understood the historical process. The function of history was encapsulated in, for example, Ecclesiasticus 44:1, 15 – 'let us now praise men of renown, and our fathers in their generation' and 'let the people shew forth their wisdom, and the church declare their praise'. As a literary influence especially, the Bible was far from a single model, being instead a collection of very different types of writing, not 'the good book' but the 'holy books' or sometimes a 'holy library'.[81] Far more crucially than a guide to the writing of history the Bible was the fountainhead of exegesis, the ultimate guide to the interpretation of meaning in any event, the perfect *speculum* and a well-spring of examples with which to look at the past present and the future.[82] Latin twelfth-century historical

75 Henry Chadwick (trans.), *Confessions*, by Saint Augustine (Oxford, 1991), p. 222.
76 Roger P. H. Green (trans.), *On Christian Teaching*, by Saint Augustine (Oxford, 1997), p. 107.
77 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, pp. 99–101.
78 GN, pp. 79–8, 200.
79 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p. 59.
80 OV, i, pp. 14–15.
81 HH, p. 669.
82 Katherine Allen Smith, 'Glossing the Holy War: Exegetical Constructions of the First Crusade, *c*.1099–*c*.1146', in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, ed. by Joel T. Rosenthal and Paul E. Szarmach, 10 (2013), p. 3. John A. Alford, 'The Scriptural Self' in *The Bible in the Middle Ages: Its Influence on Literature and Art*, ed. by Bernard S. Levy (Binghamton, NY, 1992), pp. 11–13.

narratives were littered with scriptural references and allusions just as they were filled with quotations from classical texts, and the battle rhetoric of these histories was no different.

One of the most influential 'books' of the canon in regard to twelfth-century history writing was the psalter, which was often the first book employed in basic education.[83] For use in the crafting of battle rhetoric the suitability of psalms was greater than might be initially imagined. Numerous psalms contained descriptions of violence and employed notions of victory and defeat in war which were in the exegetical tradition; given allegorical and mystical meaning in order to transform them into lessons in spiritual combat.[84] Although the twelfth century would see significant developments regarding notions of spirituality in warfare, it is important to note that the recognition and interpretation of martial themes in the psalms had a significant history prior to the twelfth century. For example, in his gloss of Psalm 78 Cassiodorus gave the prayer a specifically Maccabean setting. The story of the wars between Judas Maccabeus and his family against the Seleucid Empire has been recognized as a potential prototype martyr narrative for Christians, which of course differs from a traditional understanding of martyrs as victims rather than enactors of violence.[85] In the twelfth century Bernard of Clairvaux even wrote a short treatise on 'why the Maccabees, alone of all the righteous of the Old Law, have been accorded by the Fathers the unique privilege of an annual feast and veneration equal to our own martyrs'.[86]

Owing to the prominence of the psalms in *lectio divina*,[87] the practice of combining reading, prayer, meditation and contemplation that aimed at a deeper understanding of the Word and will of God, the language of the psalter became the language of monasticism. In this context victories were won through prayer and good works, Christians fought in spirit and defeated invisible enemies not by relying on their own strength but in humbly acknowledging their weakness and placing their trust in God. Many of these notions form important themes of twelfth-century battle rhetoric.[88] Moreover, a number of books of the Old Testament, which recounted the

83 OV, i, p. 14.

84 Katherine Allen Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*, pp. 9–10. Heydemann, 'The Orator as Exegete', p. 24.

85 Johannes Hahn, 'The Veneration of the Maccabean Brothers in Fourth Century Antioch: Religious Competition, Martyrdom and Innovation', in *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old Testament Faith Warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in Historical Perspective ed. by Gabriela Signori* (Leiden, 2010), pp. 79–104.

86 'Epistola XCVIII.', in *Sancti Bernardi Abbatis Primi Claræ-vallensis et Opera Omnia, PL*, 182, vol 2, 231. Bruno Scott James (trans.), *The Letters of Bernard of Clairvaux* (London: 1953), p. 144.

87 Duncan Robertson, *Lectio Divina: The Medieval Experience of Reading* (Collegeville, MN, 2011), pp. 126–7.

88 Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*, p. 25.

wars of the ancient Israelites, were a more than suitable source for authors of battle rhetoric to draw from, providing numerous parallels to contemporary conflicts.[89] 1 and 2 Maccabees were particularly appropriate books to draw from in the crafting of narratives of warfare, and their influence upon accounts of the First Crusade has already been examined.[90]

Although there are few instances of scriptural pre-battle speeches of the kind found in Maccabees outside of those books, many other specific books and verses proved popular for authors of battle rhetoric. Due to the fact that oration authors were often recounting stories of battle where the Christian protagonists were seriously outnumbered, a specific verse which is perhaps the most frequently drawn upon line of Scripture in regard to twelfth-century battle rhetoric is that of Deuteronomy 32:30: 'How should one pursue after a thousand, and two chase ten thousand? Was it not, because their God had sold them, and the Lord had shut them up?' That this verse of the Song of Moses, along with a similar passage Joshua 23:10, was so popular with authors of battle rhetoric is no doubt in part because of its succinct and powerful summation of divine support. These notions, which were an intrinsic part of the biblical cycles of sin, suffering through calamity, redemption through discipline and finally victory prior to an inevitable fall again into sin, were first mapped onto non-scriptural history by historians such as Orosius and Eusebius, who were models for later authors.[91] These same ideas were, as will be demonstrated in subsequent chapters, a cornerstone of twelfth-century battle rhetoric in both crusading and non-crusading circumstances.

Due to the readily available examples of armed conflict between the chosen people of God and their enemies within the Old Testament it is unsurprising that Old Testament references predominate over references to the New Testament in twelfth-century narratives of the First Crusade. More surprising perhaps is just how narrow this lead is, with references to the Gospels, particularly of Matthew, Acts of the Apostles and the Book of Revelation being evidently thought appropriate to gloss the late-eleventh century campaigns to the Holy Land.[92] That the New Testament may have been seen as less appropriate to draw upon, given its message that war was antithetical to the state of peace within which Christians were meant to dwell, was evidently no hindrance to oration authors placing the words of Peter or Paul into unabashed directives to kill. For example, Adhemar of Le Puy's battle oration in Robert

89 OV, i, p. 48.

90 Nicholas Morton, 'The defence of the Holy Land and the memory of the Maccabees', *Journal of Medieval History*, 36:3 (2010), pp. 275–93.

91 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, pp. 64–81.

92 Smith, 'Glossing the Holy War', p. 7.

the Monk's *Historia* begins with an allusion to Paul's letter to the Romans.[93]

For direct references to violence or violent imagery, a knowledge of the words of the Gospels or the rest of the New Testament was far from useless. Previous scholarship has highlighted verses such as Christ's proclamation; 'Do not think that I came to send peace upon earth: I came not to send peace, but the sword',[94] his approval of the two swords present at the Last Supper,[95] as well as the great deal of violent and military imagery in Revelation.[96] It has been suggested that the importance of these references to the New Testament within narratives of the First Crusade lies in their relevance to evangelical and apocalyptic readings of these texts that went beyond the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy.[97] Even more important for battle rhetoric are notions which originated in the New Testament which would undergo a tremendous degree of transformation during the era of the Gregorian Reform movement, the Investiture Controversy and the early crusading movement.[98] Perhaps the most crucial of these notions to directly appear in twelfth-century battle rhetoric is that of the *miles Christi*, derived from 2 Timothy 2:3.

Beyond the complex and shifting notion of the *miles Christi*, which is most often encountered in battle rhetoric as an identifier of the audience,[99] it is the language of the Old Testament which seems to have had the greater influence over oration authors. No doubt this is at least in part because of the blending of the political ideology of the Old Testament the iconography of medieval kingship. Unlike the Old Testament, or the Koran,[100] the narratives of the New Testament simply did not deal with the experience of warfare, let alone address the problems of facing a potentially superior enemy in battle, while the accounts of the wars of the ancient Israelites did exactly that.[101] However, beyond supplying material that classical rhetoricians would have found *apta* to the writing of narratives of warfare,

93 RM, p. 74.

94 Matthew 10:34.

95 Luke 22:38

96 Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*, pp. 16–17.

97 Smith, 'Glossing the Holy War', p. 9. Paul Rousset, *Les origines et les caractères de la première croisade* (Neuchâtel, 1945), p. 99.

98 Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, 'The Reform Papacy and the Origin of the Crusades', *in Le concile de Clermont de 1095 et l'appel à la croisade: actes du Colloque universitaire international de Clermont-Ferrand, 23–25 juin 1995,* (Rome, 1997), pp. 65–83. Ian S. Robinson 'Gregory VII and the Soldiers of Christ', *History*, 58 (1973), pp. 177–8.

99 For example, in the first battle oration of Baldric of Bourgueil's *Historia*, delivered by Bohemond of Taranto at the battle of Dorylaeum begins: 'Bravest soldiers of Christ, see! Now is the time for fighting'. See, BB, p. 31.

100 See for example the Tabūk Expedition, Zahid Aziz (ed.) *English Translation of the Holy Quran* (Wembley, 2010), pp. 239–40.

101 Thomas D. Hill, 'Non nisi uirgam tantum … in manu': Sigeberht's Monastic Aspirations (Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 18)', *Notes and* Queries, 53:4 (2006), p. 394.

which took place in their own age or perhaps earlier, biblical allusions in historical narratives were more than rhetorical dressing. Instead, as has been recognized in the case of crusade sermons,[102] such allusions were important parts of the texts, signalling another level of meaning, to which authors hoped at least some amongst their audience would be receptive. While narratives which focus on a single event or series of events such as the First Crusade contain similarities in terms of their interpretation, Katherine Allen Smith has demonstrated how diverse their exegetical strategies were. Similarly, while battle orations between the same texts are often comparable, instances of direct copying are rare and the ways in which different authors elaborated upon the speeches of earlier texts reveals the diversity of thought, priorities and aims of those authors. Moreover, examination of the scriptural allusions of historical narratives highlights the common ground between the practice of history and exegesis in the medieval world, emphasizing in particular the didactic and devotional purposes of the former.[103]

Several important classical texts, both prose and poetry, also loomed large in the education of oration authors, not providing rhetorical guidance as much as notable examples of direct hortatory speech in historical narratives. Of these by far the most influential was Sallust, through his two works *De coniuratione Catilinae* and the *Bellum Iugurthinum*.[104] Both narratives contain examples of battle rhetoric and their wide dissemination and impact throughout the medieval period has been well recognized in previous scholarship.[105] The examination of manuscripts alone provides a clear testament in this regard, with Sallust's two surviving works together existing in 245 copies by *c*. 1200, 162 of which (85 copies of *Iugurthinum* and 77 copies of *Catilinae* respectively) being produced in the twelfth century.[106] Not unlike the histories of the Old Testament, *De coniuratione Catilinae* and the *Bellum Iugurthinum* were concerned with a number of matters that were directly relevant to twelfth-century oration authors such as moral

102 Penny Cole, David L. d'Avray and Jonathan Riley-Smith, 'Application of Theology to Current Affairs: Memorial Sermons for the Dead of Mansurah and on Innocent IV', *Historical Research*, 63 (1990), p. 246.

103 Smith, 'Glossing the Holy War, pp. 36–9. Roger D. Ray, 'Medieval Historiography Through the Twelfth Century: Problems and Progress of Research', *Viator*, 5 (1974), pp. 42–7. Jennifer A. Harris, 'The Bible and the Meaning of History in the Middle Ages', in *The Practice of the Bible in the Middle Ages: Production, Reception, and Performance in Western Christianity*, ed. b Susan Boynton and Diane J. Reilly (New York, 2011), pp. 84–104.

104 Southern, 'Einhard to Geoffrey of Monmouth', p. 179.

105 Sallust, *C. Sallusti*, pp. 49–51, 95.

106 Reynolds, *Texts and* Transmission, pp. 341–7. Lars B. Mortensen, 'The Texts and Contexts of Ancient Roman History in Twelfth-Century Western scholarship', in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. by Paul Magdalino (London, 1992), p. 104.

judgements on historical events, the motives of historical actors, vivid battle scenes and invented speeches, proverbial maxims, warfare, politics, geography and ethnography.[107] Sallust has been shown to have been a direct influence on a number of oration authors from Widukind of Corvey, William of Poitiers (whose debt to Sallust was remarked on specifically by Orderic Vitalis),[108] to historians of the early crusade movement such as Fulcher of Chartres.[109] The influence of Sallust on Henry of Huntingdon's thinking is evidenced by his discussion on the importance of history, and specifically his remark that an understanding and appreciation of history is what separates man from beast, a notion taken directly from Sallust.[110]

As well as Sallust, the direct influence of ancient poets, in particular Lucan and Livy, are evident in the instances of quotation of their works, or at least the employment of their language, in a number of examples of twelfth-century battle rhetoric.[111] Likewise noteworthy was a work of classical antiquity that was nevertheless often studied alongside the histories of the Old Testament, that is the *De Bello Iudaico* of Josephus.[112] While that work contained no examples of battle rhetoric, there are several instances of hortatory direct speech during scenes depicting warfare, urging Jewish fighters to take their own lives rather than suffer defeat at the hands of the Romans, which bear close resemblance to more typical instances of battle rhetoric.[113]

Although the influence of classical rules of rhetoric,[114] as well as classical models of battle orations,[115] have been recognized for their impact on twelfth-century battle rhetoric, in part due to the tremendous impact of figures such as Cicero or Sallust, it would be wrong to over-emphasize the extent to which these orations were part of a classical tradition of historical writing. The use of contemporary or near contemporary texts by authors of twelfth-century battle rhetoric displays how distinctively medieval this literary phenomenon was, especially by the year 1200.

107 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, pp. 37–9.

108 OV, i, p. 63.

109 Harold S. Fink (ed.), trans. Frances Rita Ryan, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem 1095–1127*, by Fulcher of Chartres (Knoxville, 1969), p. 45.

110 HH, p. lxiii, 5.

111 See for example the reference to Lucan's *Pharsalia* in an oration delivered by Richard I during his attack on Cyprus in 1191, recorded by Roger of Howden. RH, iii, p. 106.

112 Neil Wright, 'Twelfth-Century Receptions of a Text – Anglo-Norman Historians and Hegesippus', *Anglo-Norman Studies, 31: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2008*, ed. by Chris P. Lewis (Woodbridge, 2009), pp. 177–95.

113 See for example the oration during the Roman attack on Jotapata. Henry St. John Thackeray (ed.), *Josephus in Nine Volumes II The Jewish War, Books I-III*, 9 vols (Cambridge, MA, 1926), ii, pp. 665–89.

114 Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility', p. 3.

115 Bliese, 'Courage of the Normans', p. 2.

The Context of Battle Rhetoric in the Twelfth Century

It has been noted that prior to 1100 western Europe was far from notable for an active or innovative historiographical culture.[116] However, the number of texts written within a few decades of the Norman conquests of England and southern Italy, as well as the events of the First Crusade, that detailed what were perceived by participants, non-participants and contemporaries to be exceptional events, show how Latin historiographical culture had the potential to respond to such developments.

More than half a century prior to this, the Norman world displayed a certain historiographical dynamism in Dudo of St. Quentin's *Historia Normannorum*.[117] In writing the history of a line of secular princes in the form of a *gesta*, Dudo's work was the first of its kind. The genre had a rather long history by the early eleventh century but had been used only in relation to ecclesiastical officials. As well as its secular focus, the *Historia Normannorum* was also notable for being concerned with the biographies of its heroes rather than an emphasis on particular offices or office holders.[118] This tradition of heroic writing, which emphasized epic deeds in battle, would continue into the twelfth century and beyond in works even as religiously minded as the *Historia* of Orderic Vitalis, who earlier had produced epic material and invented speeches for the *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*.[119] The heroic nature of battle orations fit naturally into this tradition and it was in the narratives of battles, which we find in authors such as Orderic, what Marjorie Chibnall called 'echoes' of *chansons de geste*.[120]

While a detailed comparison of battle rhetoric from Latin narrative histories and contemporary vernacular *chansons* is beyond the scope of this study, the relationship between such texts in terms of orations has not been entirely ignored.[121] Beyond battle rhetoric, the influence of *chansons* on history writing is well recognized. For example, despite the notion that the northern French Benedictine authors who re-wrote the account of the *Gesta Francorum*, namely Robert of Rheims, Guibert of Nogent and Baldric of

116 Marcus Bull, 'The Historiographical Construction of a Northern French First Crusade', in *The Haskins Society Journal 25: 2013 Studies in Medieval History*, ed. by Laura L. Gathagan and William North (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 37–8. Robert Bartlett (ed.) *History and Historians*: Selected Papers of R. W. Southern (Oxford, 2004), pp. 11–85.

117 For Dudo's intended audience see Bernard S. Bachrach, 'Writing Latin History for a Lay Audience *c*. 1000: Dudo of Saint Quentin at the Norman Court', *The Haskins Society Journal 20: 2008 Studies in Medieval History,* ed. by William North (Woodbridge, 2009), pp. 58–77.

118 Elisabeth van Houts (ed.), *The Gesta Normannorum ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1992), i, p. xcii.

119 OV, i, p. 77–9.

120 OV, i, p. 38.

121 John R. E. Bliese, 'Fighting Spirit and Literary Genre: A Comparison of Battle Exhortations in the 'Song of Roland' and in Chronicles of the Central Middle Ages', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 96:4 (1995), pp. 417–36.

Bourgueil, did so in order to extend and refine the narrative theologically,[122] Carol Sweetenham has argued that by far the greatest literary influence upon Robert's *Historia Iherosolimitana* were the *chansons de geste*.[123] Like Chibnall, Sweetenham drew specific attention to Robert's detailing and glorifying of the process of battle in minute detail.

If *chansons de geste* were an important influence on early twelfth-century Latin narratives of the crusading movement, then no less crucial to the continuation of this heroic tradition were those same Latin narratives, whether prose or poetry. The verse narrative *Historia Vie Hierosolimitane* of Gilo of Paris for example was either a source utilized by Robert the Monk, or else those texts shared a common ancestor.[124] That the battle rhetoric of twelfth-century Latin poetry merits further investigation is evident from the number of orations in certain poems. William the Breton's prose *Gesta Philippi Augusti* contains only a single oration, taking place at Philip's triumphant Bouvines, yet his poetic *Philippidos* contains eleven.[125] Beyond poetry, the relationship between prose narratives of the early crusading movement, in regard to exact chronological order of production, textual borrowings or more indirect influence, have already been the subject of a considerable amount of scholarly investigation.[126]

122 Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 2009), p. 135–52.

123 Carol Sweetenham (trans.)*, Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade: Historia Iherosolimitana*, (Aldershot, 2005), p. 61.

124 Christopher W. Grocock and Elizabeth Siberry (eds.), *The Historia vie Hierosolimitane of Gilo of Paris and a Second, Anonymous Author* (Oxford, 1997). Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk,* pp. 29–33.

125 Henri-François Delaborde (ed.), *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume Le Breton, historiens de Philippe-Auguste, Chroniques de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton, Tome Premire*, 2 vols (Paris, 1882–5) i, p. 273, ii, pp. 81–2, 85, 167, 185, 186, 222–3, 234–6, 310, 313–14, 315–16, 320.

126 Notably; John France, 'The Use of the Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* in the Early Twelfth-Century Sources for the First Crusade', in *From Clermont to Jerusalem: The Crusades and Crusader Societies 1095–1500 Selected Proceedings of the International Medieval Congress, University of Leeds, 10-13 July 1995*, ed. by Alan V. Murray (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 29–42. John France, 'The Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* and the *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* of Raymond of Aguilers and the *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere* of Peter Tudebode: An Analysis of the Textual Relationship between Primary Sources for the First Crusade', in *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*, ed. by John France and William G. Zajac (Farnham, 1998), pp. 39–69. Jay Rubenstein, 'What is the *Gesta Francorum* and Who Was Peter Tudebode?' *Revue Mabillon*, 16 (2005), p. 179–204. Jay Rubenstein, 'Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres: Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect' in *Writing the Early Crusades, Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. by Damien Kempf and Marcus Bull (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 24–37. Marcus Bull, 'The Relationship Between the *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*: The Evidence of a Hitherto Unexamined Manuscript (St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, 3)', *Crusades*, 11 (2012), pp. 1–17. Samu Niskanen, The Origins of the *Gesta Francorum* and Two Related Texts: Their Textual and Literary Character, *Sacris Erudiri*, 51 (2012) pp. 287–316.

While some instances of borrowings from these sources in regard to battle rhetoric are well known and have likewise been commented upon, such as Orderic Vitalis' use of Baldric of Bourgueil's *Historia* in his own account of the First Crusade, including an oration by Bohemond of Taranto,[127] other instances have received less attention. For example, Neil Wright has identified textual borrowing in Baldric of Bourgueil in the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta Consulum Andegavorum*. However, the extent of this borrowing, both from Baldric as well as from sources which Baldric himself clearly drew upon, such as an extended appeal drawn from 1 Maccabees, has not previously been recognized.[128] Yet this active selection, interpretation, re-interpretation and deployment of borrowed material utilized by oration authors is, as will be argued later, of great importance to the understanding of the wider narratives within which they are found.

That the heroic tradition found fertile ground in the campaigns of the First Crusade is unsurprising. More intriguing is the fact that contemporary, or near contemporary, Latin narratives that detail these events, despite usually being created by ecclesiastical or monastic authors, were so evidently interested in this tradition. Even in a historiographical context which saw rhetorical monographs as not fitting work for a monk,[129] one does not need to look far before finding monastic 'chroniclers' who laboured extensively on such endeavours. Many were seemingly just as keen to include the recurring rhetorical form of the pre-battle speech in these accounts, either through invention or sometimes by replication. Moreover, it is far from challenging to find examples of monastic writing that lingers on the violent, often gory details of battle or even those which purposefully emphasize martial themes. In his survey of battle orations written *c.* 1000–1250, Bliese categorized together requests for or appeals to combatants to display martial virtues alongside those to what he deemed the public recognition of those virtues, in the form of honour and glory, as well as their antithesis, infamy and shame.[130] The significance of acting courageously, as it was perceived and understood in the medieval world, was highlighted by Philippe Contamine, who recognized courage as a form of noble behaviour which, as many battle orations display, was related closely to notions of race, blood, ambition, honour, glory and renown.[131] This is not to say, as a

127 OV, iii, p. 315. Daniel Roach, 'Orderic Vitalis and the First Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, 42:2 (2016), pp. 177–201.

128 Cf. Neil Wright, 'Epic and Romance in the Chronicles of Anjou', in *Anglo-Norman Studies 26: The Proceedings of Battle Conference 2003*, ed. by John Gillingham (Woodbridge, 2004), p. 180. Paul Marchegay and André Salmon (eds.) *Chroniques D'Anjou*, 2 vols (Paris, 1865) i, pp. 146–7. 1 Maccabees 3:18–22.

129 Paul Hayward (ed.), *The Winchcombe and Coventry Chronicles: Hitherto Unnoticed Witnesses to the Work of John of Worcester*, 2 vols (Tempe, AZ, 2010), i, p. 55.

130 Bliese, 'The Courage of the Normans', p. 3.

131 Philippe Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, trans. Michael Jones (Oxford, 1984), p. 253.

brief comparison with the battle rhetoric of the *chansons* reveals, that the monastic or clerical authors of twelfth-century Latin prose narratives did not have their own priorities or their own conceptions of the events they were describing and, as subsequent chapters will argue, the simple praise of past martial achievements was far from the main concern of twelfth-century battle rhetoric authors.

The relevance of certain events central upon the political stage of western Europe in the eleventh and twelfth centuries to the writing of battle rhetoric necessarily highlights the ecclesiastical and monastic context of that same period. This context is dominated by the inseparable yet conflicting nature of the secular and religious spheres of society in this era, typified by the Gregorian Reform movement of the Church and Investiture Controversy. Growing out of tenth- and eleventh-century attempts to extradite the Church from the control of lay elites in both Rome and the localities, in order to halt what were understood to be abusive practices,[132] the reform movement would over the course of the eleventh century be forced to rely evermore on temporal power, backed by spiritual justification.[133] The ends of these means was the enforcement of what was perceived by partisans of reforming popes to be the 'right order' of Christendom. It was within this wider milieu of reform that monastics and churchmen of all kinds were writing about war with a growing regard for the moral and spiritual status of fighting men and asking questions as to their place in wider Christian society. This was undertaken in a monastic literary tradition which exegetically had long understood war as allegory, prefiguring spiritual struggles, first of Christ and the apostles, then the wider Christian community, particularly martyrs and ascetics.[134] It has been argued that the crusade movement broke with this tradition, with authors glossing narratives of the First Crusade with those explicitly militaristic psalms which thus prefigured physical rather than monastic spiritual combat.[135] However, it is perhaps more accurate to argue that notions of how spiritual combat was constituted is what had been altered, given that for some at least, crusading was spiritual combat, as one instance of battle rhetoric from the *Gesta Francorum* contends; 'you know in truth that this is no war of the flesh, but of the spirit'.[136]

While a number of authors of twelfth-century battle rhetoric were not monks, and over the course of the twelfth century battle rhetoric would increasingly be produced by clerical authors who often orbited royal courts,

132 Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050–1300* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1964), pp. 28–9.

133 Gerd Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*, trans. R.F. Bennett (Oxford, 1940), p. 1.

134 Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*, p. 9.

135 Smith, 'Glossing the Holy War', p. 16.

136 GF, p. 37.

many clerical authors would nevertheless be influenced greatly by monastic texts.[137] The French Benedictine narratives of the First Crusade, especially the work of Robert the Monk, would serve as a model for narratives of later crusades. However, monastic influence was of course far from homogenous, and although Benedictines outnumber members of any other order, substantial battle rhetoric was also penned by Cistercians, notably Otto of Freising, Aelred of Rievaulx, Ralph of Coggeshall and potentially the author of the *Libellus de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum*.[138]

The Purpose and Audience of Twelfth-Century Battle Rhetoric

Far from merely being meant to simply enliven historical narratives, battle rhetoric in the twelfth century in both crusading and non-crusading circumstances sought to reinforce particular themes of their wider narratives and impart, to what was potentially a considerably diverse audience, moral and didactic messages relevant to contemporary conceptions of violence, justice, spirituality and society.

While the argument that twelfth-century narrative histories are moral and didactic in nature is far from innovative, the discussion of didacticism in such texts has never utilized battle rhetoric in a systematic or comprehensive way. Previous scholarship of battle rhetoric has even argued that orations, in reflecting the 'reality' of medieval soldiery, were far removed from the moralizing world of legalists and theologians, ignoring the fact that many oration authors were themselves theologians.[139] Moreover, the place of didacticism in twelfth-century 'Angevin' histories has recently been challenged by Michael Staunton, who has argued that medieval historians were more interested in explaining often confusing series of historical events than they were in the creation of moral lessons. However, Staunton does concede the place of histories as *exempla* that functioned similarly to hagiography.[140] Additionally, ethics were, within both the classical and scriptural literary traditions, inseparable from the practice of interpreting past events, and while some authors were more removed from the events they described than others, battle rhetoric often concerned events recent enough to still bear direct relevance to those who engaged with these histories. This was perhaps of even greater relevance to chroniclers of the crusading movement, whose

137 Michael Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England* (Oxford, 2017), p. 25.

138 James H. Kane, 'Wolf's Hair, Exposed Digits, and Muslim Holy Men: *the Libellus de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum* and the *Conte* of Ernoul', *Viator*, 47:2 (2016), p. 108. LTS, pp. 24–50. Connor C. Wilson '"Esteemed brothers, comrades of mine …": Constructing the Piety and Pugnacity of the Military Orders through Battle Rhetoric', in *Crusades 20*, ed. Benjamin Z. Kedar, Jonathan Phillips, Iris Shagrir and Nikolaos G. Chrissis (Abingdon, 2021).

139 Bliese, 'The Just War as Concept and Motive', pp. 11–13.

140 Staunton, *Historians of Angevin England*, pp. 12, 81–3.

works were often utilized with greater intensity ahead of a new expedition. If nothing else, the continual presence of Latins in the Holy Land would have served as an ongoing reminder of the place of chroniclers, their audiences and those who took part in the crusading movement within this unbroken and ever advancing chain of history. This chain was continually presented as depending on the moral and spiritual practices of Christians to ensure victories, and that sin was thought to bring correction through defeat.[141]

Even if moral lessons were not the primary concern of chroniclers, to relegate such matters very far down a supposed list of priorities is to contradict the very words of many oration authors. Henry of Huntingdon made it clear in his *Historia Anglorum* that his aims were not only to entertain but, through what he hoped would be a work not only studied by other churchmen like himself, would use its wider appeal to encourage moral reform. Although a clergyman, Henry never shies away from presenting martial achievements he clearly approved of as done in a way that was of moral worth (*probitas*), sometimes explicitly through battle rhetoric.[142] Similarly, Orderic Vitalis saw himself as writing history to provide moral examples, and clearly intended his work to be of interest outside of the monastic community of Saint-Evroul.[143] Although the earliest narratives of the First Crusade, the *Gesta Francorum* and the account of Peter Tudebode, do not provide any similar statements of intent, others make at least curt statements regarding purpose. Fulcher of Chartres, for example, began his *Historia Hierosolymitana* by stating that it was pleasing and beneficial, to both the living and the dead, to either read or hear 'the deeds of faithful predecessors' who had followed Christ in taking the cross, in order to inspire others to better serve God.[144] Robert the Monk's *prologus* in praise of past historians, first among which was Moses, presents his account as providing a worthy model for emulation.[145] That the reading of these texts, or hearing them being read aloud,[146] could serve as effective instruction would be a notion that was underscored not only by monastic *lectio divina* but also the teachings of classical rhetoric. It was recognized by Quintilian that *exempla* were more effective at imparting certain lessons than other forms of teaching. The suitability of historical *exempla,* both good and bad, was also

141 *Pecaastis exigentibus hominum.* See, Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, p. 54.

142 HH, pp. lvii–lix, 3–9, 389–393, 481–5, 763.

143 OV, i, pp. 35–6.

144 FC, p. 115.

145 RM, p. 4.

146 Michael T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307* (London, 1979), pp. 215–16.

expressed by William of Malmesbury, Gerald of Wales and Gervase of Canterbury, the latter explicitly highlighting *exempla* as especially suited to the less well educated. Gerald also specifically discusses the usefulness of unsuccessful *exempla* to instruct their successors.[147]

The importance of memory in classical rhetoric for the purpose of delivery was foundational to the way texts were experienced by audiences beyond a lone reader. Works such as the *Gesta Francorum* even indicate in their doxology where readings would end. The proper recollection of past events was believed to be crucial to avoiding sin, especially the sin of pride which was thought to ensure chastisement once past events were perceived as being utilized to praise men rather than God. That this same notion is central to so many battle orations exposes their didactic nature.[148] The element of religious devotion evident in works such as Robert's perhaps appears to sit uneasily alongside the clear instances of commemoration, celebration and exhortation of martial achievements which form the backbone of battle orations. This tension, coupled with the clear desire of some authors to find an audience for their work that was perhaps outside of their monastic community, naturally raises the question of whom battle rhetoric was written for?[149]

Regarding the 'don't flee' *topos*, one of the most pragmatic recurring devices of twelfth-century battle rhetoric, John Benton argued that similar instances in vernacular literature were meant to instil in the audience one of the ideals of chivalry, that knights do not flee from battle.[150] However, it has been noted that within a number of Latin histories true infamy was reserved, at least on crusading expeditions, not for those who fled battle, but those who abandoned the campaign.[151] Prior to battle, shame in Latin narratives appears to be more often reserved for the criticism of inaction, hesitation or defeat. It is perhaps the case then that the 'don't flee' *topos* has more to do with the influence of military manuals such as that of Vegetius[152] which

147 IO, iv, p. 11. Roger A. B. Mynors, Rodney M. Thomson and Michael Winterbottom (ed.), *William of Malmesbury, The History of the English Kings* (Oxford, 1999), i, p. 55. William Stubbs (ed.), *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury* (London, 1879), i, pp. 84–7. EH, pp. 235–7.

148 Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, pp. 20–5, 298–402.

149 An idea explored at length in Jennifer Paxton, 'Textual Communities in the English Fenlands: A Lay Audience for Monastic Chronicles?', in *Anglo-Norman Studies 26: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2003*, pp. 123–37.

150 John F. Benton, '"Nostre Franceis n'unt talent de fuir": The Song of Roland and the Enculturation of a Warrior Class', *Olifant*, 6 (1979), pp. 237–58. Bliese, 'When Knightly Courage May Fail', p. 503.

151 William Aird, '"Many others, whose names I do not know, fled with them": Norman Courage and Cowardice on the First Crusade', in *Crusading and Pilgrimage in the Norman World*, ed. by Kathryn Hurlock and Paul Oldfield (Woodbridge, 2015), p. 29.

152 N. P. Milner (trans.), *Vegetius: Epitome of Military Science* (Liverpool, 2011), pp. 63, 92, 107–8.

argued for the uselessness of flight as a strategy for preserving lives once battle was joined, a point made explicitly by many battle orations. Even accepting a level of pragmatism or realism in the 'don't flee' *topos*, it is evident that so much of battle rhetoric was meant to impart more abstract lessons or present moral and martial examples for emulation, and so was greatly concerned with high ideals.

In terms of potential lay interest in, and exposure to, battle rhetoric the issue of language looms large. There has been recently a shift in scholarship away from the notion that the majority of lay elites were ignorant of Latin, 'the language of Lordship',[153] and although the level of Latin knowledge in lay society remains perilously difficult to determine and quantify, it has been argued that an increasing number of laymen from *c*. 1100 had some skill with the language.[154] Given battle rhetoric's not infrequent employment of the language of the liturgy, the language of battle speeches would have been perhaps more familiar to a lay audience that other common elements of Latin histories.[155] Well known of course is the phenomenon of educated men trained for the Church but who ultimately had secular and military careers, but basic training in Latin grammar, rhetoric and logic was available for many young men who were never destined for an ecclesiastical career.[156] Over the course of the twelfth century moreover, works in Latin such as family histories, once the preserve of kings, became common to lesser lords and even castellans.[157]

Intent to seek a wide audience is in part attested to by the claim, found in many historical narratives, that such works have been deliberately written in a simple style in order to accommodate a lack of expertise in Latin. Geoffrey Malaterra, writing at the close of the eleventh century, claims to have consciously chosen a plain and simple style, which, at the request of his patron, was akin to that of the classical histories which Count Roger had read to him in court.[158] The *Gesta Francorum* and the account of Peter Tudebode have been noted for their simplicity, which in the case of the *Gesta* was commented on by contemporaries. That the simple language employed echoes the Vulgate and in terms of doxology and structure almost resemble

153 Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*, pp. 59–60. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record,* p. 59.

154 Ralph V. Turner, 'The *Miles Litteratus* in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century England: How Rare a Phenomenon?', *American Historical Review* 83 (1978) p. 928. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, pp. 175–201.

155 Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 188.

156 Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*, p. 59.

157 Jean Dunbabin, 'Discovering a Past for the French Aristocracy', in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. by Paul Magdalino (London, 1992), p. 3.

158 GM, pp. 1–4.

sermons, lends even greater credence to the idea that these texts were meant to be widely disseminated.[159] Fulcher of Chartres likewise claimed that he had decided upon a simple prose style,[160] which certainly makes sense given his clear aims of popularizing the story of the First Crusade, as well as encouraging migration to the East. Given his own particular focus, it is difficult to believe that Gerald of Wales's *Expugnatio Hibernica* would not have received interest from Cambro and Hiberno-Norman lay elites. The *Expugnatio Hibernica* was even written with a table of content that would allow those interested in the speeches or descriptions of the narratives central characters to more easily access material that was relevant to their interests.[161] Likewise, with its numerous descriptions of battle, replete with cut-and-thrust details which would not be out of place in a vernacular epic, Helen Nicholson has argued that although the *Itinerarium* and Ambroise's *Estorie* sprang from different literary traditions they approached the subject matter of the Third Crusade in a very similar way, and that the same educated nobility who appreciated hearing Ambroise recited would have enjoyed hearing readings of the *Itinerarium*.[162]

While declarations of simplicity may be a common rhetorical device, this does not mean that they were without sincere meaning, nor were such professions universal. Examples of authors who claim to have written in an elaborate style, or at great length, are far from absent among surviving narratives. The extensive and sophisticated work of Albert of Aachen has been described as difficult to classify, with an audience that was likewise not easy to imagine, but one that seems to have extended beyond the cloister.[163] Moreover, Guibert of Nogent and Baldric of Bourgueil are clear in their intentions to write sophisticated works in elaborate language, worthy of their exalted subject matter, for an educated audience. However, this high literary pretension did not seem to prevent authors who did claim to write simply for a wide audience from drawing upon Baldric's work. Manuscript evidence, as well as other documentation, attest to instances of lay ownership of crusade chronicles particularly towards the end of the twelfth century, displaying the popularity of the subject.[164] Outside of a crusading

159 Robert Levine, 'The Pious Traitor: The Man who Betrayed Antioch', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*, 33 (1998), pp. 60–1.

160 FC, p. 116.

161 EH, pp. 10–19.

162 Nicholson, *The Chronicle of the Third Crusade*, p. 15.

163 Susan B. Edgington, *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Albert of Aachen, a Critical Edition* (PhD. Thesis, London, 1991), p. 41.

164 Jay Rubenstein, 'Putting History to Use: Three Crusade Chronicles in Context', *Viator*, 35, pp. 131–67.

context one of the most popular Latin 'histories' of the twelfth century to make extensive use of battle orations was Geoffrey of Monmouth's *De gestis Britonum*,[165] often called the *Historia regum Britanniae*, which survives in over 200 manuscripts, with around 70 existing before 1200.[166] A copy was known to have been owned by Walter Espec, who Aelred of Rievaulx depicts as an avid reader of history.[167]

Even if a significant majority of arms-bearing lay elites, who within the historical narratives with which this book is concerned are almost always the audience of battle rhetoric, could not read orations, it is difficult to argue that the material itself would not have been of interest to such men and their families. Furthermore, a lack of literacy in no way prohibits the idea that the conceptions of warfare, carefully crafted by oration authors along with their clear and sometimes blunt didactic lessons, could not have been transmitted to the laity.

That monastic authors, as well as the clerics who wrote battle rhetoric and often relied upon monastic writings, were interested in lay elite culture is evident from numerous instances of battle rhetoric. In a clear example of writing beyond his monastic purposes, Orderic Vitalis crafts two instances of pre-battle rhetoric that supposedly took place before a skirmish near Bourgthéroulde in 1124, which focuses more than most examples of Latin battle rhetoric on lay themes of loyalty and duty to a secular lord, in this case Henry I of England. Nevertheless, Orderic still manages to insert a lesson on the folly of knightly pride.[168] In parallel, scholarship exploring lay interest in monastic culture is abundant. Constance Bouchard and Marcus Bull have argued convincingly for the influence of monasticism on lay spirituality, and more broadly on how close families of the arms-bearing classes could be to monastic communities.[169] Moreover, lay kin groups took an active role in the monastic preservation of the past through participation in rituals involving donations, as well as other activities.[170] Discussion of the influence of monastic ideology on laymen recalls anecdotes such as Orderic Vitalis' description of the cell of Maule, a dependant of St. Evroul, and its

165 Michael D. Reeve, (ed.), *The History of the Kings of Britain: An Edition and Translation of De gestis Britonum [Historia Regum Britanniae]*, by Geoffrey of Monmouth, trans. Neil Wright (Woodbridge, 2007), p. lix.

166 Julia C. Crick, 'Two Newly Located Manuscripts of Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia regum Britannie', *Arthurian Literature* 13 (1995), pp. 151–6.

167 RS, p. 185. Nigel Saul, *For Honour and Fame: Chivalry in England, 1066–1500* (London, 2011), pp. 50–1.

168 OV, vi, pp. 349–51.

169 Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980–1198* (Ithaca, NY, 1987), pp. 247–54.

170 Marcus Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony, c. 970–c. 1130* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 14–15, 115–54. Leah Shopkow, *History and Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Washington, D.C., 1997), p. 5.

relationship to local arms-bearers, with knights often visiting to discuss 'practical as well as speculative matters' with the monks.[171]

More specifically for battle rhetoric, contact with monastic communities was understood to facilitate success in war, an obvious preoccupation of arms-bearers,[172] and much of battle rhetoric instructs its audience in how warriors had previously secured such success. This relationship again stresses the importance of the liturgy to warfare, crusading and battle rhetoric, the enactment of which had long been central to the departure of pilgrims.[173] That the liturgy had great relevance to the development of the crusading movement from its origins in pilgrimage is demonstrated by the inclusion of liturgical texts alongside accounts such as the *Gesta Francorum* in certain manuscripts.[174]

Furthermore, recent scholarship has highlighted the commonalities between monastic and 'knightly' ideals and societal spheres which have perhaps been eclipsed by the literary sharpening of this divide in the age of the Gregorian Reform movement.[175] A tremendous degree of hagiography, as well as other material, convinced monastics that the same virtues which were prized by knights, such as courage, fortitude and physical strength, made such men exemplary monks following conversion.[176] While the use of war as allegory was common across Western monasticism, the Cistercian Order was well known for accepting converts later in life, compared to the Benedictines, and for their fondness for stories of knights who had been strong and brave, but also humble and obedient in their careers, thus displaying how good knights could be good monks.[177] Furthermore, just as many monastic texts appear to contain lessons for a lay audience, monastics were sometimes called upon to display 'knightly' virtues, such as manliness,[178] or were exhorted in the manner of battle rhetoric. Such instances were by no means limited to the Cistercians, although a sermon by Aelred of Rievaulx does provide a particularly powerful example,[179] with Eadmer

171 OV, iii, pp. 204–7.

172 Bull, *Knightly Piety*, pp. 159–60.

173 M. Cecilia Gaposchkin, 'From Pilgrimage to Crusade: The Liturgy of Departure, 1095–1300', *Speculum*, 88: 1 (2013), p. 46, 63.

174 Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 2012), p. 134.

175 Adrian Cornell du Houx, *Journeys to Holiness: Lay Sanctity in the Central Middle Ages, c. 970–c. 1120* (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Lancaster University, 2015), p. 2.

176 Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*, pp. 57, 166–76.

177 Martha G. Newman*, The Boundaries of Charity Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098–1180* (Stanford, CA, 1996), pp. 24–5.

178 Katherine Allen Smith, 'Saints in Shining Armor: Martial Asceticism and Masculine Models of Sanctity, ca. 1050–1250', *Speculum*, 83. 3, (2008), pp. 591, 599–600.

179 'Sermo XXIII. De Omnibus Sanctis II.', in *Beati Aelredi Abbatis Rievallensis Opera Omnia: Accedit Wolberonis Abbatis S. Pantaleonis Coloniensis Commentarium in Cantica*, PL, 195, 340–1.

including a rousing speech delivered by St. Anselm to the monks of Canterbury on his departure from England in 1097.[180] As has been discussed earlier, battle rhetoric over the course of the twelfth century became less and less the preserve of the monastic author; however, the instruction imparted by monastics seem in part to have endured. Written around 1220 and set against the backdrop of the Third Crusade, the *Ordene de chevalerie* celebrates knighthood as a path to salvation, yet one that required serious dedication to monkish virtue and restraint.[181]

The notion of the knightly profession being practised as a route to salvation, albeit as long as it was done with a markedly high standard of virtue and piety, was of course heavily intertwined with the crusading movement and marks a significant development from the pre-crusading era. In the tenth century Odo of Cluny wrote a *vita* of the Frankish Count Gerald of Aurillac which he seemed to be interested in utilizing as a spiritual exemplar for the reform of warriors.[182] Similarly, writing in the early eleventh century, Ælfric of Eynsham re-worked the scriptural story of the Maccabees as instruction for laymen. While Ælfric's use of the example of the Maccabees is in order to valorize the spiritual struggle of the *oratores* and largely condemn the worldly violence of the *bellatores*, Judas Maccabeus remains an active warrior rather than a passive martyr.[183] Moreover, Ælfric, despite the theological problems associated with militaristic heroic virtue, nevertheless drew a link between the heroic violence of the Old Testament and spiritual heroism.[184] Similarly, Orderic Vitalis, in describing the court of Hugh d'Avranches, earl of Chester, details the activities of a *clericus* named Gerold who used examples of spiritually righteous warriors to minister to Hugh's knightly household.[185] Like Ælfric, it was Gerold's intent to ultimately glorify the spiritual warfare of monastic life, rather than physical violence. Despite this, Gerold no doubt influenced the development of a militaristic knightly piety, which would eventually manifest itself in the First Crusade.[186] After 1099, the vindication of Pope Urban's call to arms would provide a wealth of examples of warriors participating in warfare that was spiritually justified and marked out by the conduct, suffering and ultimate

180 Richard William Southern (ed.) Eadmer, *The Life of St. Anselm Archbishop of Canterbury by Eadmer* (Oxford, 1962), pp. 93–7.

181 Keith Busby (ed.), *The Anonymous Ordene de chevalerie* (Amsterdam, 1983), pp. 108–23, 153–6, 175–87. Laura Ashe, 'The Ideal of Knighthood in English and French Writing, 1100–1230: Crusade, Piety, Chivalry and Patriotism', in *Writing the Early Crusades, Text, Transmission and Memory*, pp. 159–61.

182 Smith, 'Saints in Shining Armor', p. 600.

183 John Halbrooks, 'Ælfric, the Maccabees, and the Problem of Christian Heroism', *Studies in Philology*, 106: 3 (2009), pp. 265.

184 Halbrooks, 'Ælfric, the Maccabees', pp. 281–2.

185 OV, iii, pp. 214–16.

186 James MacGregor, 'The Ministry of Gerold d'Avranches: Warrior Saints and Knightly Piety on the Eve of the First Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, 29: 3 (2003), p. 237.

victory of the participants. That this coincided with a proliferation of both crusading and non-crusading orations is far from coincidental. As subsequent chapters will argue, the battle rhetoric of holy war was purposefully crafted to impart lessons regarding warfare, spirituality and justice, while presenting these issues as being at the forefront of soldiers' minds before the perilous wager of battle. In parallel to this, battle orations were often utilized to reinforce particular themes of the wider narratives within which they are found. These varied purposes are in line with the notion that texts could be understood on different levels and received differently by a diverse audience. This was not only a lesson of classical rhetoric but also of *lectio divina*. Moreover, following the rhetorical traditions of plausibility, and in crafting material which was *apta*, for what this chapter has argued was a diverse audience, leads to the conclusion that lay interest in and understanding of these texts would likely have also varied greatly, with armsbearers being largely concerned with the righteous pursuit of martial recognition as opposed to the warnings against sin, or understanding battle rhetoric as literal truth rather than verisimilar *inventio*. On this point, and in regard to Orderic Vitalis, Chibnall discussed the case of Samuel Johnson's cessation, after three years, of writing up Parliamentary Debates for the *Gentleman's Magazine*.[187] Supposedly, Johnson elaborated these speeches from whatever scraps of information he was able to obtain. However, he told his biographer James Boswell that 'as soon as he found out that the speeches were thought genuine he determined that he would write no more of them', saying that 'he would not be an accessory to falsehood'.[188] Dr. Johnson's remark naturally distinguishes his conception of truth from the medieval understanding, where a constrained sense of truth could nevertheless accommodate invented speech.[189]

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to explore the place of 'rhetoric' within pre-battle orations and illustrate its impact upon medieval oration authors, whose speeches were part of a rhetorical tradition of historical writing that demanded plausibility and verisimilitude. This influence was translated from the classical and early medieval period down to the twelfth century through various channels. At the most basic level, the teachings of classical rhetoric were transmitted to medieval authors through popular rhetorical manuals particularly those of Cicero and Quintilian, as well as the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, with the writing of history having no specific curriculum of its

187 OV, i, p. 80.

188 George Birkbeck Hill (ed.), *Boswell's Life of Johnson: The Life (1709–1765)*, revised by Lawrence F. Powell (Oxford, 1971), pp. 150–2.

189 Morse, *Truth and Convention*, p. 7.

own. These rhetorical manuals were centrally concerned with the production of persuasive speech, which went beyond ornamentation. The essential goals of rhetoric—to teach, move and please—were bound up with a commitment to truth, as well as ethics and moral worthiness. These priorities, particularly regarding truth, would be engaged with and developed significantly over the course of late antiquity and the early medieval period, yet still have a clear bearing upon twelfth-century ideas of plausibility, verisimilitude and truth. Equally crucial for the crafting of battle rhetoric were the classical rhetorical principles which demanded the identification and understanding of an orator's audience in order to craft appropriate *inventio*; yet the allowances made in order to do so ensured that there was never a clear line between truth and falsehood in the teachings of classical rhetoric.

These lessons did not come down to the twelfth century unchanged but were filtered through a Christian tradition of rhetoric which developed notably after ideas of classical rhetoric were fused with the scriptural tradition in the work of St. Augustine. In particular, Augustine's thinking on truth, memory and the distinction between literal and allegorical truth, informed by the partition of the 'letter' and the 'spirit' of Scripture, reflected his understanding of post-lapsarian humanity as unable to possess true knowledge, including true knowledge of the past, but being forced instead to rely on indirect knowledge and interpretation. Many of these ideas contributed to the continual debate on truth in history both 'sacred' and 'secular', wherein history was often recognized as more 'truthful' than poetry, but nevertheless was understood to detail events as they might have happened.

Of great influence upon medieval history writing in the twelfth century were the words of Scripture, both as they were to be found in the many and varied books which made up the Bible, and as they were understood through the mediation of the Church Fathers, Carolingian scholars and others. The variance in the utilization of Scripture by authors of battle rhetoric reflects its versatility and multiplicity of purpose. Particularly relevant were the psalms, which loomed large in medieval education, monastic *lectio divina*, and the books of the Maccabean Wars. While the New Testament did not reflect physical warfare like the Old Testament, significant political, social and religious developments in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, in particular the Gregorian Reform movement, saw a reinterpretation or redeployment of the language of the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles and other books in order to support notions of holy war. Many of these notions found their way into twelfth-century battle rhetoric, notably the idea of the *miles Christi*. Medieval education in the late-eleventh to early thirteenth century also provided oration authors with a number of direct examples of battle from popular works of history such as those of Sallust. However, evidence of direct borrowings from classical orations is limited.

The nature of oration writing in Latin histories was shaped heavily by changes in European literary traditions, specifically from the late-eleventh century, which were driven in part by the important military events of the

age, and go some way to an explanation for the proliferation of battle rhetoric in the twelfth century. The Latin tradition has been shown to have developed in parallel with vernacular traditions and the relationship between, for example, the Latin histories of the First Crusade and twelfth century *chanson de geste* raises thorny questions as to the purpose and audience of these texts and their orations. Centrally, it has been argued that far from rhetorical ornamentation, battle rhetoric was an opportunity for authors to reinforce particular themes or notions at climactic moments through direct speech and impart moral and didactic lessons about the place of prowess, justice and piety in warfare. It has been demonstrated that battle rhetoric would have been of interest to a wide audience, beyond the setting of the monastic cloister in which it was often produced, with many works which include battle rhetoric explicitly being produced for the purpose of moral reform or to provide others with moral *exempla* to follow. While the issue of the extent of lay literacy in this period remains a difficult one, there is evidence to suggest that through various channels, members of the lay arms-bearing elite, who were almost always the audience of battle rhetoric within historical narratives, could encounter these speeches or their messages. Moreover, the level of interaction and mutual interest between lay and monastic culture both prior to and during the twelfth century is demonstrated by the commonalities between lay and monastic ideals that are to be found in battle orations, even as boundaries and definitions of spiritual warfare, holy war and holy warriors were shifting.

2 'No War of the Flesh, but of the Spirit': The Battle Rhetoric of Penitential Pilgrimage

Introduction

This chapter takes as its focus the *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*.[1] The *Gesta* is regarded in contemporary crusade historiography as one of the most valuable accounts of the 'second wave' campaign commonly called the First Crusade.[2] The text is far from lengthy, rapidly tracing events from the preaching of Pope Urban II in 1095 to the Battle of Ascalon on 12 August 1099. Nevertheless, it is difficult to overstate the importance of the *Gesta* to the present-day study of crusading, and specifically the First Crusade. This is due to the place the text occupies in the corpus of literature which was produced soon after the success of that campaign.[3] In the 50 years following the capture of Jerusalem, at least 12 prose accounts dedicated to relating the events of the expedition were penned by a varied group of writers including participants, monastics, settlers in the newly established Crusader States and 'armchair crusaders' in the West.

The *Gesta* is foundational to many of these accounts, and has even been argued to have come to occupy a place in crusading historiography as the 'normal' account of the First Crusade.[4] The text was re-written in the early twelfth century by Robert, a monk of Rheims, at the instruction of his abbot, supposedly because of the text's unpolished style and the fact that it contained no description of the Council of Clermont.[5] The 'unsatisfactory' nature of the text also provoked Baldric of Bourgueil and Guibert of Nogent

1 As well as the Hill and Mynors' edition, utilized herein, modern editions also include Heinrich Hagenmeyer (ed.), *Anonymi Gesta Francorum* (Heidelberg, 1890).

2 Jean Flori, 'Mort et martyre des guerriers vers 1100. L'Exemple de la première croisade', *Cahiers de Civilisation Médievale,* 34 (1991), p. 128. Riley-Smith, *Crusades*, p. 20.

3 This family of texts has been illustratively mapped by John France. France, 'The Use of the Anonymous', p. 42.

4 John France, 'The Election and Title of Godfrey of Bouillon', *Canadian Journal of History,* 18 (1983), p. 321. France, 'Use of the Anonymous', p. 29.

5 RM, p. 3.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003044611-3

to produce their own re-workings. So fundamental was the *Gesta* to the story of the First Crusade that it was even utilized for both anecdotes and narrative structure by other eyewitnesses, including Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres.[6] It has also been long suggested that the *libellus* that Ekkehard of Aura came across while on pilgrimage to Jerusalem was the *Gesta*; however, that there is no direct evidence for this has been highlighted by several commentators in the text.[7]

The *Gesta* is an obvious starting point for an examination of 'crusading' battle rhetoric. This chapter will examine the text of the *Gesta* with reference to what has been discovered and posited about the account's own dynamic history.[8] In doing so, it will establish the major themes and preoccupations of the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta*, which will serve as analytical groundwork for the examination of how these themes were developed, abandoned or reinvented in later orations. This chapter will also argue that, in spite of its foundational place amongst the corpus of contemporary writings on the First Crusade, there is little that could be described as conventional in the *Gesta*'s battle rhetoric by the standards of previous historiography. The battle orations of the *Gesta* resist the interpretative framework of John Bliese, as well as many of his conclusions concerning the phenomenon of battle rhetoric. Far from being most concerned with the presentation and praise of Christian martial virtues or revealing glimpses of bellicose pragmatism beneath an ideological veneer, the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* is largely concerned with devotional spirituality and notions of pilgrimage, which were central to the new kind of holy war Urban had called for in 1095. Moreover, the 'crusading' rhetoric of the *Gesta* will be shown to represent a break from earlier examples of battle rhetoric, both in terms of the influences upon those speeches, as well as the forms which they ultimately took. This is the case not only when comparing the rhetoric of the *Gesta* to orations from non-crusading warfare, but can also be recognized through a comparison with eleventh-century orations supposedly delivered against Muslim opponents, where certain, perhaps backwards cast, notions of holy war and crusading have been previously recognized.[9] In doing so, this chapter will highlight the variance of battle rhetoric, as well as the weakness of a typology which too narrowly defines 'common motivational appeals', or fails to contextualize often complex and multifaceted notions about divine

6 Rubenstein, 'What Is the *Gesta Francorum*', p. 180, 184, 188.

7 Conor Kostick, *Social Structure*, p. 11. France, 'Use of the Anonymous', pp. 29–31, 35. Rubenstein, 'What Is the *Gesta Francorum*', p. 183 n. 25.

8 This is in line with much of the recent scholarship on the *Gesta*, see Rubenstein 'What Is the *Gesta Francorum*', p. 203, as well as on the examination of what is already the well-studied Latin accounts of the First Crusade, Kempf, 'Towards a Textual Archaeology of the First Crusade', pp. 116–17.

9 Kenneth Baxter Wolf, *Making History: The Normans and their Historians in Eleventh Century Italy* (Philadelphia, PA, 1995), pp. 146–7.

aid, the place of virtue in warfare, the invocation of the cross of Christ or the Holy Sepulchre, etc.[10] Lastly, this chapter will demonstrate an aspect of both crusading and non-crusading rhetoric which will be subsequently developed in later chapters. That is, rather than serving simply or even primarily as rhetorical ornamentation to a narrative, battle orations often serve to draw attention to, or specifically reinforce, certain important themes of their wider narratives. While many of these themes are broad enough to be almost universal, such as the divinely directed nature of the important events of history and in particular the outcome of wars or battles, others are more pointed and specific. One common, but not always present theme of battle rhetoric, with specific relevance to crusading warfare, is a concern for 'correct' aims and righteous intentions amongst combatants, giving many orations an important moral and didactic aspect. This aspect would, like many of the ideas of the *Gesta*, be subject to subsequent development by later writers.

Text

The *Gesta Francorum* survives in seven manuscripts, as well as an attested to but not extant manuscript which was utilized by Jacques Bongars. The likely earliest of these is the early twelfth-century Vatican *Reginensis* Latin 572.[11] The account is divided into ten books, with the last book having been completed shortly after the Battle of Ascalon, where the narrative ends. Rosalind Hill suggests that the first nine books were written before the author left Antioch in November 1098. This is plausible, particularly in light of book ten's distinctive nature; but there is no direct evidence within the text itself to support this idea. On the other hand, the *Gesta*'s treatment of the Holy Lance, initially accepted as genuine before a loss of favour, becomes more comprehensible if the text is considered to be the product of two different phases of writing.[12]

Despite its place at the heart of the historiography of the First Crusade, there is little known about the provenance of the *Gesta*. Although criticized for its style and credulousness by both medieval and modern commentators, recent historiography has come to appreciate the text as rich, complex and resisting straightforward interpretation. Jay Rubenstein has done much to display the dynamic nature of the *Gesta*'s development, attempting to account for the anomalies between the *Gesta* and notably the narrative

10 Bliese, 'Courage of the Normans', pp. 2–4.

11 GF, pp. xxxviii–xlii. Cf. Louis Bréhier, *Histoire anonyme de la première croisade* (Paris, 1924), pp. xxiv–xxv.

12 GF, p. ix, 68. France, 'The Use of the Anonymous', p. 30. Colin Morris, 'Policy and Visions: The Case of the Holy Lance at Antioch', in *War and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich,* ed. by John Gillingham and James C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), p. 37, n. 14.

attributed to Peter Tudebode which have prompted others to seek after an 'Ur-*Gesta*' which has been occasionally hypothesized but never convincingly conceptualized.[13]

Even accounting for the nuances of Rubenstein's presentation of the 'literary tradition' of the text, this study accepts the understanding of the *Gesta* as an eyewitness source, not dependent on any other narrative.[14] In regards to its ultimate authorship, one of the few details that can be stated with conviction is that the author was a member of the southern Italian crusading contingent led by Bohemond of Taranto, referring to France as '*ultra montanas*' and showing the greatest familiarity with Bohemond's army. He was similarly knowledgeable concerning the landscape of southern Italy, and perhaps came from Apulia, which in one of his long speeches Kerbogha, Atabeg of Mosul, lists as his ultimate objective of conquest.[15]

Given this likely Italian origin and the subject matter of Christian war against Muslim enemies, it is perhaps tempting to understand the *Gesta* in light of a broader historical tradition centred on the late-eleventh-century Mediterranean. Herbert E. J. Cowdrey has, for example, drawn attention to the similarities between the narrative of the *Gesta* and that of the *Carmen in victoriam Pisanorum*, a poetic treatment of the campaign against the African city of Mahdia by the forces of Pisa and Genoa in 1087.[16] However, the battle rhetoric of the *Carmen* and the *Gesta* are considerably divergent in their form and focus. While a greater degree of similarity is to be found between the battle orations of the *Gesta* and Geoffrey Malaterra's *De Rebus Gestis Rogerii Calabriae et Siciliae Comitis et Roberti Guiscardi Ducis fratris eius*, this only serves to throw into sharp relief the devotional and penitential aspects of the *Gesta*'s battle rhetoric. Moreover, unlike Malaterra, who states clearly the influence of classical histories upon his text,[17] the *Gesta* is largely devoid of the sort of classical allusions which are to be found in the works of those who sought to improve upon its story.

Notably, the *Gesta*, along with many other First Crusade Latin histories, has also been viewed in light of the tradition of Old French epics, with Colin Morris arguing that the *Gesta* is itself a *chanson de geste*.[18] While certainly well supported, this view perhaps obscures the spirituality integral to the text. Moreover, an acceptance of Rubenstein's conception of the *Gesta* as ultimately a collection of camp stories and sermon material reinforces the

13 Rubenstein, 'What Is the *Gesta Francorum*', p. 181. France, 'Use of the Anonymous', pp. 30, 40–1.

14 France, 'Use of the Anonymous', p. 59.

15 GF, p. xi, xii, p. 1.

16 Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, 'The Mahdia Campaign of 1087', *English Historical Review*, 92 (1977), pp. 21–2.

17 GM, p. 4.

18 Colin Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum* as Narrative History', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 19 (1993), pp. 61–7.

notion of Norman Housley, that many of the dominant ideas of the *Gesta* likely represent the reality of contemporary popular understandings of the crusade endeavour, rather than an ecclesiastically driven picture of events.[19] This dichotomy, which an examination of battle rhetoric can go a significant way to challenge, is at the heart of an enduring debate over the status of the *Gesta*'s assumed singular author, as a cleric or layman. The suggestion that the *Gesta* was written by a literate knight, who had perhaps turned away from a career as a cleric by the death of one or more older brothers, was suggested by Heinrich Hagenmayer and followed by Hill in the introduction to her edition.[20] This view has been challenged by Hans Oehler, and more recently by Morris and Rubenstein,[21] and the notion of clerical authorship now has wider favour.

While an examination of the *Gesta*'s battle rhetoric cannot conclude this ongoing debate, which has most recently been revived by Conor Kostick,[22] its conclusion can make a contribution. Rather than being chiefly concerned with the celebration of martial heroics, as suggested by Bliese's broad overview of contemporary battle rhetoric,[23] the orations of the *Gesta* both reinforce and provide insight into the wider themes, particularly the spiritual themes, of the text as a whole. They provided the author with a way of displaying how important religious ideas were lived in the context of fighting through the actions of the crusaders.[24] It would be a leap, however, to assume that this spirituality necessarily reflects ecclesiastical status, as Kostick has highlighted that the authorship dichotomy should clearly not be framed as being between a cleric and an uneducated knight.[25] Nevertheless, the fact that the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* is far more concerned with the spiritual than the martial lends some weight to the notion of clerical authorship.

The *Gesta* contains seven instances of battle rhetoric.[26] The first is delivered by Bohemond of Taranto to his soldiers during what is usually called

19 Rubenstein, 'What Is the *Gesta Francorum*', pp. 200–4. Norman Housley, *Fighting for the Cross: Crusading to the Holy Land* (London, 2008), p. 184.

20 GF, p. xiii.

21 Hans Oehler, 'Studien zu den *Gesta Francorum*', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch,* 6 (1970), pp. 60–6. Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum*', pp. 55–71. Jay Rubenstein, 'What Is the *Gesta Francorum*', p. 187.

22 Conor Kostick, 'A Further Discussion on the Authorship of *the Gesta Francorum*', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 35 (2009) pp. 1–14.

23 Bliese, 'Courage of the Normans', p. 5.

24 William J. Purkis, *Crusader Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia c. 1095–1187* (Woodbridge, 2008), p. 8.

25 Kostick, 'A Further Discussion', p. 2.

26 Six is the number of orations given by Bliese in 'The Courage of the Normans', p. 23. However, there is no oration or direct speech of any kind at pp. 94–5 while this paper includes the brief hortatory statement of Bohemond at p. 36 and the speech given by a vision of St. Andrew to Peter Bartholomew at p. 60 Bliese does not include these in his bibliography of speeches.

the Battle of Dorylaeum on 1 July 1097.[27] The second speech, which also takes place during that same encounter, is described as a message passed 'along our lines'.[28] The third and fourth speeches are both delivered by Bohemond, one to an assembly of crusade leaders prior to battle, the other to Robert FitzGerard *suo conostabili*, which takes place during combat at what is conventionally called the Lake battle on 9 February 1095.[29] The fifth speech, again by Bohemond, is delivered to his soldiers before the assault upon Antioch in which the crusaders seized the city.[30] The sixth speech is delivered to the Provençal visionary Peter Bartholomew by St. Andrew during the siege of Antioch by Kerbogha.[31] The final speech is given by Raymond Count of Toulouse to his soldiers during the siege of Jerusalem.[32] Although none of the speeches are extensive, the longest being Bohemond's speech to Robert FitzGerard at only 36 words, they merit close study. While criticized for its rustic style, the *Gesta* makes tremendous use of direct speech at a number of significant points in the narrative. The employment of direct speech highlights the importance of the events they concern, including Pope Urban's preaching of the crusade, the response to Bohemond's questions about the nature of the expedition and the warning of Adhemar to the crusaders, related at his death. An oration even precedes the significant moment when the crusade leaders appoint Bohemond as the single commander of the entire force. Moreover, the *Gesta*'s author was aware of how to use direct speech to achieve his desired effect. He purposefully writes Turkish speech in a bizarre way to distance Turks from the language of the rest of the narrative. Likewise, the lament of Firuz during the attack on Antioch is given in Greek.[33]

Rhetorical Topoi

It is unsurprising that amongst the most common elements of battle rhetoric in orations, written c. 1000–c. 1250, is the appeal to martial virtues. Bliese's typology categorized together such calls for bravery, valour, displays of honour, promises of glory or an encouragement in some way to act in a

27 GF, pp. 18–9. For the battle, see John France, *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 169–85.
28 GF, pp. 19–20.
29 GF, pp. 36–7.
30 GF, p. 46.
31 GF, p. 60.
32 GF, p. 97.
33 GF, pp. xv–xvi, 1–2, 7, 32, 60, 74. France, *Victory*, p. 245.

manner fitting to combat. Many of these calls naturally often contain a gendered element.[34] Examples of such appeals in the *Gesta* can be found in Bohemond's speech at Dorylaeum, where he calls upon his knights to fight *uiriliter*.[35] Similarly, Robert FitzGerard is called upon before the Lake battle at Antioch to charge the enemy *ut vir fortis*.[36] It is also with such terms that the *Gesta* author has one of Bohemond's soldiers describe their commander,[37] at once praising Bohemond's prowess while revealing their own inexperience in combat.

Although instances of these quite loosely defined motivational appeals are not rare in the *Gesta*, they are nevertheless underdeveloped, and extended appeals to prowess or honour never occur. This is in clear contrast to contemporary or near contemporary examples of orations from other narratives. In an instance of *oratio obliqua,* William of Poitiers presents a harangue delivered by William, Duke of Normandy, before meeting with the Anglo-Saxons at Hastings:

> He reminded the Normans that in many and great dangers they had always come out victorious under his leadership. He reminded them all of their fatherland, of their noble exploits and their great fame. Now they were to prove with their arms with what strength they were endowed, with what valour they were inspired.[38]

Such extended appeals to martial virtues, calls for valour or references to honour can also be found in orations from what have been argued to be, though not without challenge, accounts of 'pre-crusades'.[39] One oration from Malaterra's *De rebus gestis* is devoted almost entirely to these ideas:

> Most valiant ones, you cannot afford to sit here any longer as if your strength were spent. If you do, you will find yourselves submerged in the depths of putrid death, no longer breathing, and bereft of any memory of military honour. Be mindful of our ancestors, of our people, and of our widespread reputation for vigour. Avoid the stigma of future reproach. Remember how many thousands of the enemy you killed at Cerami when you were fewer in number than you are now. Fortune, which was smiling on you then, is still directing you. Return to your

34 Bliese, 'The Courage of the Normans', p. 3. A notable instance wherein notions of masculinity are deployed as encouragement by a female speaker is discussed in Patricia Skinner, '"Halt! Be men!": Sikelgaita of Salerno, Gender and the Norman Conquest of Southern Italy', *Gender & History* 12: 3 (2000), pp. 622–41.

35 GF, p. 19.

36 GF, p. 37.

37 GF, p. 36.

38 WP, pp. 124–5.

39 Rousset, *Les origines et le caractères de la première croisade,* pp. 27–42.

> former strength! Despite your initial flight, if you turn around now and win a victory your honour will be restored.[40]

That such extended appeals to martial ideals are lacking in the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* illustrates how, comparatively speaking, the praise of martial achievements and depictions of prowess were not as great a concern of the author. Where such instances do appear in the *Gesta*, it will be demonstrated that they are almost always found alongside other, primarily spiritual motivational appeals, and chiefly serve to reinforce those same notions.

This is not to say that the author was uninterested in military affairs, far from it. Indeed, the *Gesta*'s author displays a keen interest in martial matters, and by no means shied away from recording the gruesome realities of contemporary warfare, even when extremely violent actions were undertaken by Christians. This focus on the fighting conducted over the course of the First Crusade could be interpreted as support for the notion that the author was a soldier, rather than a cleric. Kostick has argued that of all the 'groups' that took part in the First Crusade, the author of the *Gesta* was most interested in the *milites*. The numerous references to *milites* within the *Gesta*, and the fact that the author writes about certain military manoeuvres in the first person, have been taken by Kostick as evidence that the author was a knight.[41] However, as has been demonstrated, an examination of the *Gesta*'s battle rhetoric is far from occupied with martial appeals.

Furthermore, it is not difficult to challenge the notion that the author was, of all the participants on the First Crusade, most concerned with *milites.* While recounting the key events of the expedition would require significant attention being given to *milites,* it could be argued that the *Gesta* is far more concerned with the poor. However, given the difficulties of distinguishing between the different social groups that took part on the First Crusade, it might be more accurate to suggest that the author of the *Gesta* was keen to display the nature of the crusade as a venture of poverty. The crusaders as a whole are described as *gens mendica*, and there are numerous references to the poor quality of the arms that they bear.[42] Significantly, in lamenting his defeat at the Battle of Ascalon, an Egyptian emir despairs at the fact that he had been defeated *gente mendica* who carry nothing but the bag and script.[43] A serious concern for the poor is explicitly stated in the *Gesta* in the speech by Adhemar of Le Puy that is written out after the story notes his death. This speech calls on *milites* to show concern for the poor and warns them

40 GM, p. 46. Kenneth Baxter Wolf (trans.), *The Deeds of Count Roger of Calabria and Sicily and of His Brother Duke Robert Guiscard* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2005), p. 113.

41 GF, pp. xii, 29, 35–7. Kostick, *The Social Structure of the First Crusade,* p. 16.

42 GF, p. 14, 51.

43 GF, p. 96.

that without the *pauperes* the *milites* will not achieve salvation.[44] Adhemar's speech occurs at a crucial moment within the text and seems to reflect the author's concern for the stability of the expedition in the wake of the victory at Antioch.

On the other hand, it is impossible to deny the bellicose attributes of the *Gesta* which, along with the infamous instance wherein the crusaders are harangued by a promise of attaining riches, discussed later,[45] seem to conflict with evidence of a surviving version of one of the decrees issued at Clermont. According to which, 'whosoever for devotion alone, not to gain honour or money, goes to Jerusalem to liberate the Church of God can substitute this journey for all penance'.[46] Such instances have been used to argue that battle rhetoric displays what little regard oration authors could have for the directives of theology or legal theorists when writing about war. Supposedly these examples represent flashes of insight into the true motivation of warriors and are to be best understood within the rhetorical tradition of plausibility.[47] However, when examined with an appreciation of concordant appeals, and understood within their narrative context, such notions do not appear contradictory to the kind of holy war Urban had called for in 1095, and largely serve to reinforce the spiritual themes of the *Gesta*.

In discussing the crusade's participants, the *Gesta* does seem to differentiate between the *milites*, referring to mounted warriors, and other kinds of soldiers. In his speech at Dorylaeum, Bohemond instructs *omnes milites* to go and fight bravely, while the *pedites* are instructed to pitch the camp.[48] This instance may reflect the secular values of military prestige and family honour that were the forerunners of the chivalric ethos and certainly played a part, though perhaps not a great part, in the recruitment of the First Crusade.[49] However, this may be to read too much into details that no doubt in part accurately reflect the reality of the complex sequence of military events called the Battle of Dorylaeum. It is, moreover, the case that at the close of the eleventh century a precise meaning of the term *miles*

44 GF, p. 74.

45 GF, p. 20.

46 Robert Somerville (ed.), *The Councils of Urban II, Volume 1: Decreta Claromontensia* (Amsterdam, 1972), p. 74. Jonathan Riley-Smith, *First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 2009), p. 41.

47 Bliese, 'The Just War as Concept and Motive', pp. 11–13. Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility', p. 3.

48 GF, p. 19.

49 Marcus G. Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony, c. 970–c. 1130* (Oxford, 1993), p. 8.

remains elusive, although the picture becomes considerably clearer over the course of the twelfth century.[50]

Of greater significance than the precise social connotations of *miles* is Bohemond's description of his *seniores* as *milites Christi*,[51] a description found throughout the text, and largely absent from the battle rhetoric of other contemporary narratives.[52] While *miles* is often better understood to mean soldier rather than knight, the idea of *miles Christi*, specifically in its utilization by Pope Urban II, was aimed in particular at the class of knights and castellans from which Urban himself had come. The full vocational terms of the *miles Christi* could not apply to *pedites*.[53] Heavily utilized by Pope Gregory VII and authors of investiture polemics, the phrase *miles Christi* was ultimately derived from the Second Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy.[54] The Epistles have been noted for the motif of depicting inner struggles as physical ones, and the notion of the *miles Christi* has been argued to have its origins in Christ's instruction to do battle with the forces of evil. For the better part of a millennium, the *miles Christi* was not a soldier at all, but a monastic, or holy man.[55] The development and deployment by Urban II of the idea of the *miles Christi* focused on the group that Urban more than any other wished to see take part in the pilgrimage of the First Crusade: professional arms-bearers. The 'new' knighthood of men who were *milites Christi* was contrasted with the 'old' knighthood of robber warriors. Rather than fighting for wealth and earthy glory, *milites Christi* participated in war as an act of Christian charity. This was exemplified in certain scriptural passages, one of which, Matthew 16:24, is included in the very beginning of the *Gesta* as the scriptural impetus of the crusade.[56] Crucially, the vocation of the *miles Christi* was presented as one that was as valid, or almost as valid, as that of the monk, as their combat with material evil paralleled the spiritual combat against the forces of the Devil in which professed religious engaged. This association of the warriors of the First Crusade with the monastic life is exemplified in the *Gesta*'s longest battle

50 *The gesta Normannorum ducum*, i, p. lv. R. Allen Brown, 'The Status of the Norman Knight', in *War and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich,* ed. by John Gillingham and James C. Holt (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 18–32.

51 GF, p. 18.

52 GF, p. 6, 11, 19, 23, 70, 88.

53 Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A Short History* (London, 1990), pp. 8–9. Bull, *Knightly Piety*, p. 18.

54 Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. by M. W. Baldwin and W. Goffart (Princeton, 1977), pp. 202–3. 2 Timothy 2:3.

55 Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*, p. 18, 71. Smith, 'Saints in Shining Armor', p. 57. Franco Cardini, 'The Warrior and the Knight', in ed. Jacques Le Goff, trans. Lydia C. Cochrane, *The Medieval World* (London, 1990), p. 78.

56 Riley-Smith, The Crusades, pp. 8–9. GF, p. 1.

oration, in which Bohemond tells Robert FitzGerard: 'You know in truth that this is no war of the flesh, but of the spirit'.[57]

These instances of battle rhetoric highlight how central notions of penitential devotion, pilgrimage and the conceptual monasticization of the laity current in the late-eleventh and early twelfth century are to the construction of crusading warfare found in the *Gesta*. Through battle rhetoric these various threads of spiritual warfare, parallel to but with a clear precedence over physical warfare, are intertwined with elements more typical of battle orations. In this way, the earliest crusaders were 'recruited to the ancient ranks of the *milites Christi*',[58] whose fighting was done not primarily upon earthly battlefields but within the mortal soul. Bohemond is the *Gesta*'s *miles Christi* par excellence and is described as *fortissimus Christi athleta,* an ideal that Robert FitzGerard is told to live up to in the speech before the Lake Battle.[59] Like the designator *miles Christi*, *athleta Christi* also had long held connotations of spiritual combat. The ninth-century monk Hrabanus Maurus in a commentary on the Epistles amalgamated the spiritual *miles* and *athleta* of St. Paul into a single figure.[60] While many of these elements of the *Gesta*'s battle rhetoric are brief and often underdeveloped a number of these notions would undergo tremendous development at the hands of later authors who wrote about the First Crusade.

That same oration prescribing spiritual warfare concludes with Bohemond bidding his constable: *vade in pace; Dominus sit tecum ubique*. The significance of this lies in its relationship to contemporary liturgical practice. The use of '*vade in pace*', a form of the dismissal after Mass, reflects the importance of liturgical practices to the *Gesta* author and the wider crusade expedition. This is corroborated by other eyewitness accounts, such as that of Raymond of Aguilers, who twice compares the crusader army in battle order to a church procession.[61] Regarding themselves as pilgrims, the crusaders adopted on their march to Jerusalem the liturgical practices that had been traditionally associated with pilgrimage.[62] The importance of the liturgy is elsewhere displayed in the *Gesta*'s narrative on a number of

57 GF, p. 37.

58 James H. Kane, 'The Impact of the Cross on Western Crusade Terminology, c. 1095–1250' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2016), p. 54. Horst Richer, '*Militia Dei*: A Central Concept for the Religious Idea of the Early Crusades and the German Rolandslied', in *Journeys towards God: Pilgrimage and Crusade*, ed. by Barbara N. Sargent-Baur (Kalamazoo, MI, 1992), pp. 107–26.

59 GF, p. 29, 37.

60 'Enarrationum In Epistolas Beati Pauli Liber XXIII – Expositio in epistolam I ad Timotheum', in *B. Rabani Mauri Fuldensis Abbatis Et Moguntini Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia, PL*, 112, vol 6, 630–2. Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture*, p. 21.

61 John H. Hill and Laurita L. Hill (eds.), *Le 'Liber' de Raymond d'Aguilers* (Paris, 1969) p. 81, 125.

62 Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, p. 24.

occasions. In the direst of circumstances during the siege of Antioch, the crusaders supposedly responded to their plight by fasting, performing processions, receiving communion and celebrating mass. The crusaders' devotion to liturgical practice inspired Jonathan Riley-Smith's description of the crusade as a great monastic community on the move, its path marked by regular and solemn intercessory liturgies.[63] This devotion can also be seen in the text of the *Gesta* through the notes of various feast days in relation to specific events of the crusade, as well as through the doxology of the text.[64] These instances, coupled with the lack of scriptural references beyond perhaps the most widely known books of the Gospels and Psalms, and the echoes of New Testament language, which Robert Levine has suggested is intended to emulate the Vulgate, reveal the sermonistic nature of the text.[65] This would lend weight to the understanding of battle rhetoric advanced in Chapter One as being intended to enhance the accessibility of works which sought to impart instructive, didactic conceptions of war, in which the physical battles of the crusaders were presented as righteous, quasi-monastic and chiefly spiritual, warfare.

Given this conception, it is unsurprising that, as with martial motivational appeals, the *topos* of material reward is also given a religious element. Notwithstanding the arguments against the idea that materialism was a significant motivation in the recruitment of the First Crusade,[66] and the requirement that the crusaders travel to the East not out of a desire for wealth, at the Battle of Dorylaeum, the crusaders were supposedly encouraged by the idea that if victorious they would gain great riches.[67]

However, the motivation of wealth employed by the author of the *Gesta* is justified by the reasoning that spoils attained after victory were God-given. The phrasing of the passage in which wealth is used as a motivator at Dorylaeum is that the crusaders will gain riches if it pleases God.[68] The lack of dichotomy in the presentation of this appeal is far from universal; however, for the author of the *Gesta*, it is clear that wealth, like victory, is God-given. That the taking of spoils could serve moralizing ends narratively has been highlighted by Rubenstein,[69] and was similarly presented as the God-given result of righteous warfare in the Old Testament.[70] It was nevertheless crucial to the success of the crusading endeavour for the pilgrims to possess righteous intentions, with the author noting that it was precisely because

63 Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, p. 150.
64 GF, p. 9, 14, 17, 27, 31, 38, 42, 71, 97.
65 Levine, 'The Pious Traitor', pp. 60–1.
66 Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, pp. 45–7.
67 GF, p. 20.
68 GF, p. 20.
69 Rubenstein, 'What Is the *Gesta Francorum*', p. 179.
70 Deuteronomy 20:10–14. Numbers 31:7–18, 52–54.

locals did not realize the crusaders were *peregrini* that they feared them as robbers,[71] and they are often presented as being unconcerned with personal gain. For example, immediately after the defeat of Kerbogha, the *Gesta* claims that crusaders opt to pursue fleeing Turks rather than seek any spoils.[72] Likewise, the highly valued standard seized at Ascalon by Robert of Normandy provided a devotional gift to the Holy Sepulchre.[73] Furthermore, as with appeals to martial virtue, the single promise of riches in the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* contrasts sharply with the more numerous and often significantly more developed instances of this appeal in other narratives.

In framing its martial and material motivations in religious or devotional terms, these notions are brought more closely in line with the most significant theme of the *Gesta*'s battle rhetoric, and of the text more widely, that of the divinely directed nature of the events being narrated. Four of the *Gesta*'s seven battle orations contain assurances that God is with, or will support, the crusaders.[74] These instances make clear that the success of the endeavour was directly attributable to God, which is furthermore stated in the *Gesta* by the figure of Christ, in a vision supposedly received by a 'certain priest' who had taken refuge in a church during an enemy attack.[75] After St. Peter and the Virgin Mary appear to intercede on behalf of the crusaders, whose sin is identified as the cause of their predicament, Christ promises to send assistance after five days. This is repeated in the oration delivered a short while later to Peter Bartholomew by a vision of St. Andrew, who tells Peter:

> Arise, go and tell the people of God to have no fear, but to trust surely with their whole hearts in the One True God, and they shall be victorious everywhere, and within five days God will send them such a sign as shall fill them with joy and confidence, so that if they fight, their enemies shall all be overcome as soon as they go out together to battle, and no-one shall stand against them.[76]

Rather than God merely providing the crusaders with courage, as Kerbogha's mother claims he does for Bohemond and Tancred, the divine aid that is ultimately received is in the form of legions of saints, led by the warrior saints George, Mercurius and Demetrius. The literal truth of their appearance is something the author is eager to stress.[77] Victory, as a result of faith or trust in God and power of the saints, was a feature of

71 GF, p. 8.
72 GF, p. 70.
73 GF, 97.
74 GF, pp. 19–20, 37, 46, 60.
75 GF, p. 58.
76 GF, p. 60.
77 GF, p. 55–6, 69.

eleventh-century battle orations, particularly against Muslim opponents. Andrew of Fleury concludes the battle oration he invented for his depiction of the Battle of Torà (1003) with an extended example of such an appeal.[78]

Unlike the *Gesta Gvillelmi*, the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* relates divine support not to the '*iustam causam*' being fought for, but as the result of trust or *fides* in Christ and his sign.[79] The *Gesta*'s deployment of the Holy Cross in battle rhetoric highlights its significance to the wider narrative. The adoption in 1095 of cloth crosses sewn onto the crusaders' clothing was in part a manifestation of a powerful theme of contemporary devotional writing, the significance of the cross to Christians. It was directly equated by Pope Urban with Christ's instruction that, 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me'.[80] This is not only amongst the opening statements of the *Gesta*, but provides the impetus behind Bohemond's famous cutting up of his finest cloak to fashion crosses.[81] In the *Gesta*'s second battle oration, the crusaders are told to be *unanimes in fide Christi* and *Sanctae Crucis uictoria*.[82] It is clear that, as a potent symbol, the cross had multiple meanings.[83] The sign of the cross as an emblem of victory had its origins in the famed vision of Constantine at the Milvian Bridge on 28 October 312.[84] The reworking of Eusebius' account by Tyrannius Rufinus would ensure that the idea of the victory-bringing cross would have a long history in the tradition of Latin historical writing.

The protective, talismanic quality of the cross, is also manifest in the *Gesta*, with Bohemond being described as 'protected on all sides by the sign of the cross', in a fashion reminiscent of an instance in the *vita* of St. Martin.[85] In an earlier instance, the Count of Flanders is said to have been 'armed at all points with faith and with the sign of the cross'.[86] Likewise, crusading rites that absorbed the older practice of blessings of the cross emphasized its protective and salvific power.[87] Given that the spirituality of the crusaders developed over the course of the journey,[88] this association

78 AF, p. 189.

79 WP, p. 108. GM, p. 43–4. Wolf, *Deeds of Count Roger,* p. 109. GF, pp. 19–20.

80 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, pp. 32–3. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, p. 24. Matthew 16:24.

81 GF, p. 1, 7.

82 GF, p. 20.

83 Norman Housley*, Fighting for the Cross*, pp. 51–2.

84 For the battle and its legacy see Raymond van Dam, *Remembering Constantine at the Milvian Bridge* (Cambridge, 2011).

85 GF, p. 37, 68. Jacques Fontaine (ed.), *Sulpice Sévère. Vie de saint Martin. I. Introduction, texte et traduction* (Paris, 1967), p. 260.

86 GF, p. 31.

87 Gaposchkin, 'From Pilgrimage to Crusade', p. 64.

88 Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade,* p. 30.

likely reflects the anxieties of the crusaders, for whom the darts of enemies were literal as well as spiritual.

Of greater significance than its protective qualities, however, was the dimension of adopting the cross onto clothing as a sign of personal religious devotion which, as a preparatory act prior to military campaigning, was unprecedented in 1095.[89] It was the difficulty and danger of taking the road to Jerusalem that made it such a severe and highly meritorious penance[90] and the *Gesta* is quick to establish the link between the Holy Cross and penance. Urban is said to have preached that the crusaders 'must suffer for the name of Christ many things, wretchedness, poverty, nakedness, persecution, need, sickness, hunger, thirst and other such troubles, for the Lord said to his disciples, 'You must suffer many things for my name'.[91] This is shortly after Urban called for the faithful to 'take up his cross'. Moreover, the crusaders are described by the *Gesta* as wearing the badge of the cross on their right arm, or between their shoulders, a visual expression of the scriptural ideal of *imitatio Christi*.[92]

While the language of being signed with the cross had an ancient history, which was exegetically revived in the eleventh century,[93] the cross was not an emblem of pilgrimage prior to 1095. Instead, it seems to have been brought to pilgrimage from a monastic context. More specifically, it has been argued that Urban was influenced by a combination of the theological legacy of Cluny in regards to cross-devotion as well as a more personal interpretation of Daniel 2:21 wherein the *populus christianus* replaced the sacred emperor in effecting necessary change in Christendom.[94] Thus, in his alignment of pilgrimage with the monastic life through the adoption of the cross as a sign of their vow, Urban transformed pilgrimage, although he did so in a way both churchmen and the laity would likely have understood, with penance being an important feature of lay piety which had also come from monasticism.[95] Like baptism, or entrance into the religious life, the adoption of the cross symbolized a form of conversion in the hopes of some form of freedom from sin.[96] Such a conversion demanded the moral and spiritual reform which in part explains the moralizing and didactic nature of the *Gesta*'s battle

89 Kane, 'Impact of the Cross', p. 52.

90 Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, p. 27.

91 GF, p. 2. Acts 9:16.

92 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, p. 32.

93 Kane, 'Impact of the Cross', p. 62.

94 Matthew Gabriele, 'The Last Carolingian Exegete: Pope Urban II, the Weight of Tradition, and Christian Reconquest', *Church History*, 81 (2012), p. 808–11. Matthew Gabriele, *An Empire of Memory: The Legend of Charlemagne, the Franks, and Jerusalem before the First Crusade* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 144, 153–9.

95 Kane, 'Impact of the Cross', p. 78–100. Bull, *Knightly Piety*, p. 167.

96 Katharine Breen, *Imagining an English Reading Public, 1150–1400* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 125–8.

rhetoric discussed earlier, many instances of which would receive further theological development. Without such notions the pilgrims would have failed to achieve the aim of their adoption of the cross, to leave behind the sinful past and live in the future in repentance.

This central notion of penitential devotion is expressed in the *Gesta* though numerous accounts of the suffering and deprivations of the crusaders. After Dorylaeum, the text recounts how in the Anatolian desert the Franks 'barely emerged or escaped alive, for we suffered greatly from hunger and thirst, and found nothing at all to eat except prickly plants which we gathered and rubbed between our hands'.[97] Later at Antioch, we are told that the lack of supplies was such an issue that men ate leaves, thistles and trees as well animal skin: 'These and many other troubles and anxieties, which I cannot describe, we suffered for the Name of Christ and to set free the road to the Holy Sepulchre; and we endured this misery, hunger and fear for six-and-twenty days'.[98]

Penitential suffering, like the notion of martyrdom, is never explicitly stated in any of the battle rhetoric in the *Gesta*, although later accounts of the First Crusade would utilize both in their orations. This is despite the author's clear interest in these notions. The *Gesta* has Pope Urban claim that 'great will be your reward', citing Matthew 5:12, wherein such rewards are received in heaven.[99] In relaying the story of an unfortunate group of German crusaders who, going on ahead of the main Frankish forces, became isolated and were killed or captured by Turks, the *Gesta* claims that they 'were the first to endure blessed martyrdom for the Name of our Lord Jesus'.[100] Moreover, in the aftermath of the crusaders' first major success, the capture of Nicaea, the *Gesta* relays that:

> We besieged this city for seven weeks and three days, and many of our men suffered martyrdom there and gave up their blessed souls to God with joy and gladness, and many of the poor starved to death for the Name of Christ. All these entered Heaven in triumph wearing the robe of martyrdom which they have received, saying with one voice, 'Avenge, O Lord, our blood which was shed for thee, for thou art blessed and worthy of praise forever and ever. Amen'.[101]

The lack of martyrdom as a motivating appeal in the *Gesta*'s battle rhetoric, if not the broader narrative, is perhaps best understood as a reflection of the author's understanding of the expedition as a pilgrimage, rather than the

97 GF, p. 23.
98 GF, pp. 62–3.
99 GF, p. 2. Matthew 5:12.
100 GF, p. 4.
101 GF, p. 17.

germinating form of holy war it was actualizing into. It is crucial that the *Gesta* claims that martyrdom was not just granted to those who died fighting the enemies of God, but to those who starved to death in the name of Christ. It is only with the First Crusade that a mass of material concerning warrior martyrs first appears,[102] while death on pilgrimage, however, had long been thought to be meritorious.[103] For the *Gesta* author, the essence of the crusade was penance, of which the risk and hardship of battle was just one aspect, symbolically embodied by the cross. Hence it is the cross, not the promise of the martyr's crown, which the *Gesta* author does place narratively speaking at the forefront of the crusaders' minds before combat through battle rhetoric.

This use of the cross is but one way in which the *Gesta*'s battle rhetoric is distinguished from its predecessors. Like the cross, the Holy Sepulchre is utilized in order to reinforce the wider spiritual themes of the narrative. At the Battle of the Lake, Bohemond tells Robert FitzGerard to 'fight valiantly for God and the Holy Sepulchre'.[104] Despite the considerable debate over the place of Jerusalem in Urban's preaching,[105] the ultimate goal of the crusaders in the *Gesta*, even more so than the city of Jerusalem itself, is the recovery of the Sepulchre. The text opens by relating the papal preaching of the crusade, which was understood to have taught that 'if any man, with all his heart and all his mind, really wanted to follow God and faithfully to bear the cross after him, he could make no delay in taking the road to the Holy Sepulchre as quickly as possible'.[106] When the text narrates the suffering of the crusaders, it does so with reference to the Sepulchre,[107] and when the crusade appears to be in serious danger of disintegration, it is the Sepulchre that the *Gesta* author fears will be abandoned.[108] This fixation on the Holy Sepulchre in part reflects the view of Jerusalem that was prevalent in western Europe until 1099, that Jerusalem was the city of the Holy Sepulchre.[109]

The emphasis on the Holy Sepulchre in the *Gesta* reinforces the conception of the First Crusade as a pilgrimage. The crusaders understood themselves to be pilgrims on the *via Sancti Sepulchri* and even at the end of the four-year campaign the Sepulchre remained at the forefront of the participants' minds.[110] At the siege of Jerusalem in 1099, the *Gesta* explains that it was decided to attack the city with war machines so that 'we might enter and

102 Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade,* pp. 115–16.
103 Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade,* p. 24.
104 GF, p. 37.
105 Sylvia Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City,* p. 9. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 6. Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, 'Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade', *History*, 55 (1970), p. 180.
106 GF, p. 1.
107 GF, p. 62.
108 GF, p. 62, 72.
109 Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, p. 63.
110 GF, p. 1.

worship at our Saviour's Sepulchre'.[111] In utilizing so heavily the image of the cross and of the Sepulchre, the *Gesta* displays the significance of the ideal of *imitatio Christi*, of which penitential pilgrimage was an expression, to those who took part in the First Crusade.[112]

An element that defies Bliese's typology, which nevertheless features in the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta*, and which reflects and reinforces the wider contemporary spiritual understanding of the crusade, is that of Christian unity. In the second speech at Dorylaeum, the crusaders are called upon to stand *'unanimes in fide Christi'*.[113] Similarly, in the speech before the attack on Antioch, Bohemond tells his men to go *'securo animo et felici concordia'*.[114] The idea of unity is also perhaps being expressed in the last oration of the *Gesta*, in which Raymond of Toulouse encourages his men to be quicker about their attack on Jerusalem upon hearing that other crusader forces had already entered the city.[115] It is certainly true that the mission of the First Crusade united a number of diverse groups of people, supposedly through their love of God and neighbour,[116] in what was perhaps a reflection of how the ideal of *imitatio Christi* provided unity to the new and varied forms of religious life which flourished from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries.[117]

In practice, it can be seen in the *Gesta* that unity between the varied forces of the crusade was a necessary precaution for the security of the undertaking. Book I relates how a company of Italian crusaders led by a man named Rainald was cut off from the rest of their army, before being easily routed by the Turks, their fate being either death or slavery. Soon after, a German crusader is reported to have betrayed a number of his own companions to the Turks.[118] These events seem to foreshadow the author's mistrust of the leaders of the main crusader force, expressed most forcefully when describing the oaths made to Alexius.[119] As the crusaders moved further into Anatolia and on into the Levant, the need for unity grows ever greater. A story in Book IX concerning deserters fleeing from Antioch describes how in attempting to save themselves they are instead cut down by the Turks.[120] Likewise, the tasks of foraging for food and searching out supplies of water held the same dangers.[121] Given that, in

111 GF, pp. 89–90.
112 Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, p. 67. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, pp. 30–58.
113 GF, p. 20.
114 GF, p. 46.
115 GF, p. 91.
116 Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, p. 113.
117 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, p. 27.
118 GF, pp. 3–4.
119 GF, p. 12.
120 GF, p. 57.
121 GF, p. 88–9.

1095, the idea of fighting for Christ was embryonic, and would be shaped by the experience of the crusaders, it seems likely that the danger of the expedition and the suffering the participants faced emphasized this idea of unity in the accounts that documented it.[122] This emphasis on unity also helps explain why the *Gesta* dealt with Bohemond's abandonment of the crusade after Antioch so curtly.[123]

However, this theme does not merely reflect the experience of crusading, but like other prominent elements of battle rhetoric, illustrates how the lived reality of the crusaders was underscored, propelled and actualized by scriptural and devotional ideals. Like the crucial notions of *imitatio Christi* and *contemptus mundi*, the ideal of the first Christian community in Jerusalem that is described in the Acts of the Apostles, the *ecclesia primitiva*, and the apostolic life (*vita apostolica*) it fostered, loomed large in the thinking of the religious communities in this period.[124] The essence of the primitive Church was thought to have been captured in the verse: 'And all they that believed were together and had all things common. Their possessions and goods they sold, and divided them to all, according as everyone had need',[125] and: 'And the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul. Neither did anyone say that aught of the things which he possessed was his own: but all things were common unto them'.[126] Moreover, in the first four chapters of Acts of the Apostles, the 'followers of the Way' are repeatedly described as behaving with 'one mind', *unanimiter*.[127] The emphasis on unity through the text's battle rhetoric, which utilizes related terms that denoted being of one-mind, such as *unanimis* and *concors*, reflects the importance of the idea of the *vita apostolica* and *ecclesia primitiva* within the text. The *Gesta* uses the word *unanimiter* to describe the military deeds of the crusaders five times.[128] Moreover, the fact that the *Gesta* uses *unanimiter* interchangeably with *uno corde et animo*, the exact language of Acts 4:32, suggests a direct link between the First Crusade and the spirit of the *ecclesia primitiva*, as well as exhibiting the ability of battle rhetoric to present in a succinct and forceful manner notions which were central to the ideological framework of those who took the cross.[129]

Conclusion

The hortatory content of the *Gesta*'s battle rhetoric focuses on several distinct but interconnected motivational appeals, many of which have been identified

122 Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, pp. 154–5.
123 GF, p. 84.
124 Purkis, *Crusader Spirituality*, pp. 30–58.
125 Acts 2:44–5.
126 Acts 4:32.
127 Purkis, *Crusader Spirituality*, p. 47.
128 GF, pp. 19–20, 31, 37, 60, 70.
129 Purkis, *Crusader Spirituality*, p. 47, 51.

as common to a broad survey of Latin orations in the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries. However, in regard to its content, form and function, the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* cannot, when properly contextualized, be accurately described as standard or conventional. Despite an apparent broader statistical frequency within the genre, the *Gesta*'s orations have little interest in appeals to martial virtues or prowess, especially in comparison with other contemporary orations. Moreover, where such notions do appear, they are often part of broader spiritual notions central to the wider narrative. The distinctive nature of the *Gesta* in this regard seems to be in part influenced by an understanding of the crusading endeavour as divinely guided, wherein the righteous intentions of the participants were directly related to the success of the endeavour. This is reinforced by the presentation of crusaders as combatants, in the taking of spoils, as well as the formulation of the *Gesta*'s single short promise of wealth in its battle rhetoric.

However, the notion of righteous warfare being divinely directed was of course not new at the turn of the twelfth century, and battle orations had by 1100 long been part of the broader literary history of Christian holy war. The *Gesta* is to an extent part of this tradition; however, when understood within an eleventh-century context regarding the development of notions of holy war, ecclesiastical and monastic reform and contemporary practices of pilgrimage, the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* takes on significant devotional and penitential aspects hitherto unrecognized by the study of battle orations. This is most evident in the elements of the *Gesta*'s battle rhetoric which have often fallen outside of a broad typology of orations, such as the appeals to the Holy Cross, the Holy Sepulchre, the emphasis on Christian unity, as well as the ideal of the *miles Christi*. As has been argued, many of these notions were revived during the spiritual and ideological reform taking place at the end of the eleventh century, and subsequently found their way into the battle rhetoric of a new kind of military endeavour, at once externally violent and internally penitential.

This penitential spirituality, rather than rhetorical flair or military pragmatism, is at the heart of the *Gesta*'s use of direct speech, and its battle rhetoric more specifically, although the text blends all three of these elements to a degree. The liturgical and exegetical elements of the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* also serve to distinguish it from the orations of works such as Malaterra's *De rebus gestis*, being devoid of the kind of references to Old Testament wars and warriors that authors often had recourse to when attempting to convey the conflicts of their own day as righteous. The battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* clearly lacks some of the anxiety and self-consciousness of those texts. For example, while the *Gesta* is satisfied in presenting the capture of riches as God-given, Malaterra employs a reference to Acts 4:35, 'and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need',[130] in

130 GM, p. 50. Wolf, *Deeds of Count Roger*, p. 119. Acts 4:35.

justifying what is otherwise an extended appeal of promised wealth. Similarly, promises of divine aid in the *Gesta* are never presented as contingent on the enactment of Christian rites, as they are in comparable instances.[131] The penitential nature of the crusade was, for the author of the *Gesta*, manifest. In this way, the difference between the Mediterranean wars of the late-eleventh century and the First Crusade is highlighted by the divergent ways in which they were justified through battle rhetoric.

The *Gesta* has been characterized as both rich and complex as well as raw and unpolished, being described by Rubenstein as a hurriedly constructed piece of work.[132] Whether the text was quickly assembled or not, an examination of the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* certainly reveals a level of care and attention given to its instances of direct speech with papal preaching, penitential spirituality and likely the motivations, hopes and anxieties of the crusaders informing the content of these speeches. Even as rhetorical invention this hortatory content is invaluable as an indicator of crusading ideology which would be subsequently developed by those who, in the first few decades of the twelfth century, were to rewrite the story of the *Gesta* and the First Crusade.

131 See, for example V. de Bartholomaeis (ed.), *Storia de' Normanni di Amato di Montecassino volgarizzata in antico francese* (Rome, 1935), p. 241. Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility', pp. 10–11.

132 Rubenstein, 'What Is the *Gesta Fancorum*', pp. 200–4.

3 The Victory of the *Familia Christi* and the Development of Crusade Ideology

Introduction

The previous chapter analyzed battle orations found in the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*, establishing a specific set of distinct but largely interconnected ideas and motivational appeals that related to crucial themes of the *Gesta* as a whole. It argued that although it is possible to identify the commonly recurring rhetorical *topoi* of the genre, the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* is far from conventional when examined against the typology and broader statistical approach of previous scholarship.[1] Moreover, the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* is best understood in part as the inheritor of a particular rhetorical tradition of oration writing, but at the same time it represents a break with, or at the very least a significant watershed of, that same tradition. While conceptions of righteous wars conducted with or directed by divine support had a long history prior to 1095, the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* ought to be understood within the context of developing notions of holy war influenced by eleventh-century ecclesiastical and monastic reform as well as contemporary practices of pilgrimage. This serves to illuminate the devotional and penitential aspects of the *Gesta*'s specific construction of crusading warfare as well as the penitential spirituality at the heart of the *Gesta*'s battle rhetoric.

This chapter builds directly upon Chapter Two, analyzing a number of later Latin narratives of the First Crusade. It will begin with an overview of the narratives under consideration. It will subsequently examine the place of specific appeals and themes present in the *Gesta*, as well as considering the place of those rhetorical appeals identified in previous historiography, within this broader corpus. The chapter will also display how recurring and prominent notions were utilized by oration authors and to what end. It will examine how these ideas were deployed, developed or discarded by specific authors. As with Chapter Two, the development and deployment of specific ideas through battle rhetoric will be contextualized within the ecclesiastical

1 Bliese, 'Rhetoric and Morale', pp. 203–19.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003044611-4

setting of the early twelfth century, which will serve to highlight the moral and didactic purposes of many of the orations examined herein. Finally, this chapter will go some way towards illuminating the influence of crusading battle rhetoric beyond the confines of traditionally defined 'crusading'. It will do so by establishing instances of influence by crusading rhetoric on non-crusading battle orations, both through concordant motivational appeals as well as direct textual borrowing. It will display how, through the use of 'crusading battle rhetoric', non-crusading warfare could be sanctified by oration authors, as well as how the early crusading movement had a broader impact upon how righteous warfare was conceived and constructed in the twelfth century. Prior to the thematic analysis, a brief description of the corpus is included. Two 'eyewitness' texts, Peter Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere* and the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Fulcher of Chartres, along with another account closely related to the former, are treated first. Then considered are three northern French Benedictine accounts of Baldric of Bourgueil, Robert of Rheims and Guibert of Nogent. The remaining texts are subsequently listed broadly chronologically.

Corpus

Peter Tudebode

Thought to be a priest of Civray in Poitou who took part in the First Crusade, Peter Tudebode is otherwise an obscure figure, although he perhaps travelled to the East with his brothers.[2] The extent to which Peter should be considered the author of the entire work has been called into question.[3] Moreover, the value of this account has been dominated by the issue of the relationship between *Tudebode* and the *Gesta*. Heinrich Hagenmeyer argued in his edition of the *Gesta Francorum* that Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere* was the derivative work of the two.[4] One the other hand, John and Laurita Hill claimed Tudebode, the *Gesta* and Raymond d'Aguilers all drew on a common now lost source.[5] This theory has been more recently questioned by John France who argues that the idea of a lost common source fails to explain why a French priest would have employed the term *nos* when describing events from the viewpoint of the Italian contingent on the First Crusade.[6] Because they share extended sections of identical text, it has been questioned whether they should be

2 PT, p. 13, 97, 116.

3 Rubenstien, 'What is the *Gesta Francorum*', p. 202.

4 Hagenmeyer, *Anonymi Gesta Francorum*, pp. 50–8.

5 John H. Hill and Laurita L. Hill (trans.), *Peter Tudebode: Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere* (Philadelphia, 1974) pp. 10–3.

6 France, 'The Use of the Anonymous *Gesta Francorum*', p. 31.

considered separate works at all,[7] and the most recent studies of the relationship have posited several solutions which approach the issue by postulating stages of composition.[8] Nonetheless the *Gesta* has largely retained its primacy. The dating of the text has also been tied to this ongoing debate, with composition in the first few years of the twelfth century likely.[9]

There are six instances of battle rhetoric in the *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere,* many of which align with the orations of the *Gesta*. The first is delivered by Bohemond of Taranto at the Battle of Dorylaeum.[10] The second speech is described as being 'passed along' the lines of the crusaders and takes place shortly after the first.[11] The third speech is delivered to Robert FitzGerard by Bohemond during battle outside of Antioch.[12] The fourth speech, again delivered by Bohemond, occurs prior to scaling the walls at Antioch.[13] The fifth speech, not found in the *Gesta Francorum*, is delivered by a messenger who is sent to Raymond Pilet during the fighting around Antioch.[14] The final speech, as in the *Gesta*, is delivered by Raymond of Toulouse, to his soldiers outside of Jerusalem.[15]

Fulcher of Chartres

The other eyewitness account central to this chapter is the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Fulcher of Chartres.[16] The text was edited by Hagenmeyer, who argued that the *Historia* was written in several stages over the course of the first three decades of the twelfth century.[17] A participant on the First Crusade, Fulcher departed with the army led by Robert of Normandy, Robert of Flanders and Stephen of Blois.[18] The scope of the *Historia Hierosolymitana* extends beyond the First Crusade, covering the reign of King Baldwin I of Jerusalem from 1100 to 1118 in Book II and the reign of Baldwin II until 1127 in Book III. Fulcher joined Baldwin's contingent during the First Crusade prior to his departure from the main army and journey to Edessa, relying on the *Gesta Francorum* and Raymond

7 Bull, 'The Relationship Between', p. 2, 16.
8 Rubenstien, 'What is the *Gesta Francorum*'. Bull, 'Relationship'.
9 GF, p. x.
10 PT, p. 52.
11 PT, p. 53.
12 PT, p. 72.
13 PT, p. 85.
14 PT, p. 136.
15 PT, p. 140.
16 For the significance of, and issues that arise from, the 'eyewitness' label, see Elizabeth Lapina, *The Miraculous in the Chronicles of the First Crusade* (Centre County, PA, 2015), pp. 15–36. Marcus G. Bull, *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative: Perception and Narration in Accounts of the Second, Third and Fourth Crusades* (Rochester, NY, 2018), pp. 1–71.
17 FC, pp. 46–7.
18 FC, pp. 163–7.

of Aguiler's *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* for his account of the main crusader force during this absence.[19] In his own words, Fulcher was the chaplain of that same Baldwin.[20] The three instances in which Fulcher uses the surname *Carnotensis* indicates his place of birth. Beyond the text, he is identified by a charter of 1112 as Prior of the Mount of Olives.[21]

The majority of the battle rhetoric in Fulcher's account is found in Book II. However, two instances occur during the fighting around Antioch with one occurring soon after the other. In the first instance, a vision appears to a fleeing cleric and tells him to return to his fellow Christians, promising aid in the forthcoming battle. The second speech is delivered by an apparition of the brother of a crusader trying to flee the city.[22] Although Bliese does not list this instance in his bibliography of battle speeches,[23] both orations contain hortatory content.

The most substantial battle rhetoric in Fulcher's *Historia* occurs during Book II, and highlights his aim of exalting Baldwin I. Baldwin delivers two long speeches to his soldiers before battle, the second being notable for the fact that the Christian forces are subsequently defeated.[24] The final speech takes place on the 26th of August 1105 and is an impassioned call for both fighting men and prayers to God for an upcoming battle. It is delivered by the Patriarch of Jerusalem.[25]

Historia Belli Sacri

Sharing a great deal of material with the *Gesta*, Tudebode and several other First Crusade narratives, the *Historia Belli Sacri*, or *Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusolymarum*, likely originated at the Abbey of Monte Cassino. It was possibly written at some point between 1130, the year Bohemond II died, and 1153, as it remarks that Ascalon was still in Muslim hands. Jean Flori has suggested the date 1131, while Evelyn Jamison contended that the majority of the text was put together in 1118, with a reworking taking place in 1131.[26]

In terms of its battle rhetoric, the *Historia* largely follows the *Gesta* and Tudebode, with some speeches repeated almost verbatim. These include the two orations which take place at Dorylaeum;[27] however, Bohemond's

19 Fink, *Fulcher of Chartres*, pp. 3–4.
20 FC, p. 215.
21 Verena Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres: Studien zur Geschichtsschreibung des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Düsseldorf, 1990), p. 31.
22 FC, pp. 245–6.
23 Bliese, 'Courage of the Normans', p. 23.
24 FC, pp. 411–2, 439.
25 FC, pp. 492–3.
26 HBS, p. xvi.
27 HBS, p. 30. Cf. GF, pp. 18–20.

speech to Robert FitzGerard is considerably extended, as is the rallying cry preceding this.[28] Moreover, Bohemond's speech before the scaling of the walls at Antioch is notably altered.[29] Shortly before this is a brief speech by Rainald Porchet with some hortatory content.[30] The vision of St. Andrew is likewise included, along with the exhortation, despite its absence from Tudebode's work.[31] Also included is a speech towards the end of the narrative, perhaps inspired by but certainly distinct from an oration of the *Gesta Tancredi*, which is delivered by Eberhard of le Puiset.[32]

Baldric of Bourgueil

Like Robert of Rheims and Guibert of Nogent, Baldric of Bourgueil was a historian of the First Crusade who sought to improve upon the *libellum … nimis rusticanum* he encountered,[33] which was without a doubt the *Gesta Francorum*.[34] Baldric's *Historia*, composed in around 1105, with possible revisions perhaps taking place after Baldric took up his archbishopric in 1107,[35] is just one part of an impressive corpus of work that includes poems, letters, elegies, sermons and hagiography.[36] Baldric's high level of education and access to a variety of writings is evidenced by the number of classical allusions in the *Historia*, as well as his other works.[37] Although not as widely copied as Robert, the manuscript tradition of Baldric's *Historia* extended beyond France and into Anglo-Norman England and Spain.[38]

Baldric's account of the First Crusade has been compared to *chansons de geste*, in an attempt to account in some part for its popularity. Moreover, Steven Biddlecombe has argued that it was Baldric's desire to ensure that the story of the First Crusade served as an example to others who might take the cross that prompted him to introduce and stress important theological ideas

28 HBS, pp. 50–51. Cf. GF, pp. 36–7.
29 HBS, p. 64. Cf. GF, p. 46.
30 HBS, p. 58.
31 HBS, p. 79, Cf. GF, p. 60.
32 HBS, p. 125.
33 BB, p. 4.
34 Steven Biddlecombe, 'Baldric of Bourgueil and the *Familia Christi*', in *Writing the Early Crusades*, p. 11.
35 BB, pp. xxiv–xxx.
36 Biddlecombe, 'Baldric of Bourgueil and the *Familia Christi*', p. 9.
37 Gerald A. Bond, '*Iocus Amoris*: The Poetry of Baudri of Bourgueil and the Formation of the Ovidian Subculture', *Traditio*, 42 (1986). Jürgen Blänsdorf, 'Ancient Genres in the Poem of a Medieval Humanist: Intertextual Aspects of the "*De sufficientia votorum suorum*"(c. 126 H.) of Baudri of Bourgueil (1046–1130)', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 2 (1995), pp. 143–93.
38 Steven Biddlecombe, 'Baldric of Bourgueil and the Flawed Hero', in *Anglo-Norman Studies 35: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2012*, ed. by David Bates (Woodbridge, 2013), p. 81.

that are supported by motifs reminiscent of epics, as well as plausible and flawed characters that his audience could identify with, in language that would be both accessible and enjoyable.[39] Although Baldric roughly follows the narrative of the First Crusade found in the *Gesta*, he greatly expanded some of the *Gesta*'s orations, as well as inventing new speeches. The majority of the *Historia*'s seven battle speeches are delivered by Bohemond. These include two orations at the Battle of Dorylaeum,[40] one of which is delivered by Bohemond,[41] and four during the fighting that takes place around Antioch.[42] The final battle oration takes place outside the walls of Jerusalem, prior to the crusaders beginning their attack. This speech, which is delivered by one amongst a group of priests, not only contains a number of the recognizable and common appeals categorized by Bliese, but it is also clearly concerned with vocalizing the theology of the crusade.[43]

Robert the Monk

Of the three northern French Benedictines to rework the story of the First Crusade as it appears in the *Gesta*, Robert of Rheims, often called Robert the Monk, was by far the most successful. Despite Robert's casting of the First Crusade as an almost entirely French endeavour, and thus a French success,[44] his account was widely copied and read outside of French speaking territories and survives today in eighty-four full Latin copies dating from between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries. Beyond the fact that Robert was a monk of the abbey of St. Rémi at Rheims, little is known about him, though he may have for a brief time been abbot there.[45] In his own words Robert was compelled to write by his vow of obedience[46] to Abbot B. who is named as Bernardus in two twelfth-century manuscripts, Benedictus in at least six others, and in other manuscripts simply as B or N.[47] The identification of Abbot B. has been a source of some debate, with previously favoured candidates shown to be unlikely.[48] It has been suggested rather that B. was in fact Baldric of Bourgueil.[49] Compared to the *Gesta*,

39 Biddlecombe, 'Baldric of Bourgueil and the Flawed Hero', p. 80.
40 BB, pp. 31–2.
41 BB, p. 32.
42 BB, p. 45, 46, 47, 47.
43 BB, pp. 107–9.
44 Kempf, 'Towards a Textual Archaeology', p. 117.
45 Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, pp. 2–4.
46 RM, p. xlii, 3.
47 Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, pp. 1–2.
48 RM, pp. xxvi–xxviii.
49 Karlheinz Hilbert (ed.), *Baldricus Burgulianus Carmina* (Heidelberg, 1979), pp. 258–61.

Robert provides a lengthier description of the Council of Clermont, which he claims to have attended.[50]

Sweetenham, in the introduction to her translation of the *Recueil* edition, suggested a date for the completion of the *Historia* of *c.* 1106–1107.[51] However, the fashion in which Robert refers to King Philip of France in the past tense has led Damien Kempf and Marcus Bull, the most recent editors of the text, to argue for *c.* 1110 as a more likely date of completion.[52]

Robert's *Historia* contains five instances of battle rhetoric, most of which occur during the fierce fighting around the city of Antioch, a crucial episode in many narratives. The first instance of battle rhetoric is a long speech given by Bohemond to raise the morale of desperate men besieging the city.[53] The second instance is a pre-battle sermon delivered by the Papal Legate Adhemar of Le Puy immediately before the besieged Christians give battle against the army of Kerbogha the governor of Mosul.[54] The third instance follows shortly after and is delivered by Hugh of Vermandois during the battle itself.[55] The penultimate battle oration is delivered by Adhemar following the arrival of the saintly army of heaven.[56] The final speech is given by Raymond of Toulouse outside of Jerusalem. Like the version of this speech in the *Gesta* there is little hortatory content in this final speech.[57]

Guibert of Nogent

Like Robert and Baldric, the Benedictine monk Guibert of Nogent rewrote the events of the First Crusade from another source, likely the *Gesta Francorum*, the style of which he found lacking.[58] He also drew upon the account of Fulcher of Chartres, which nevertheless earned his ire.[59] The account itself provides a number of clues as to the dating of the text, being likely between *c.* 1107–1109. However, Rubenstein has argued that the text underwent revision until *c.* 1120.[60]

Guibert's attitude to the crusade is exemplified not only in the title of his account but also in one of the instances of battle rhetoric in which

50 RM, p. 3.
51 Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 7.
52 RM, p. xl.
53 RM, p. 39.
54 RM, p. 74.
55 RM, p. 75.
56 RM, p. 76.
57 RM, p. 99.
58 GN, p. 78.
59 GN, p. 329.
60 GN, pp. 51–6, 133, 194, 265, 287, 293. Jay Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, NY, 2002), pp. 94–6. Jay Rubenstein, 'Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres: Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect', in *Writing the Early Crusades*, pp. 24–37.

Bohemond tells his soldiers unambiguously 'it is not you who have fought, but Christ'.[61] There are six battle speeches in *Gesta Dei Per Francos*. Two speeches occur during the Battle of Dorylaeum, one delivered by Bohemond and another by a group of the leaders of the crusade. Three speeches occur around Antioch, two being delivered by Bohemond and another by Hugh of Vermandois. The final speech, which also occurs in the *Gesta* and Robert the Monk, takes place during the siege of Jerusalem and is delivered by Raymond of St. Giles.[62]

Albert of Aachen

Albert of Aachen's *Historia Iherosolimitana* is by far the longest contemporary narrative of the First Crusade, being around ten times as long as the *Gesta Francorum*, based on the pagination of the *Recueil* editions.[63] It has been more recently edited and translated by Susan Edgington. The first six books of Albert's *Historia* detail the First Crusade and were in their final form by 1102,[64] while the later six are dedicated to detailing the events of the first two decades of the Latin East and were completed sometime in the 1120s.[65] Not only were the two halves of the *Historia* composed separately, but they likely also circulated separately.[66]

Albert has been described as having a superficial knowledge of the classics, but a much deeper knowledge of Scripture.[67] Despite expressing an earnest desire to take the cross, Albert was an 'armchair crusader'. Nevertheless, working from Aachen did not prevent Albert from furnishing his account with a high degree of detail regarding life and events in the Latin East, no doubt utilizing the testimony of returning crusaders.[68]

Albert's first six books contain nine battle orations. The first is delivered by a bishop to embattled crusaders fighting around Nicaea.[69] The second is delivered by Adhemar of Le Puy to a group of men under his command at the Iron Bridge.[70] The third speech, which is also delivered by Adhemar, takes place as the crusaders assault Antioch.[71] The fourth speech occurs shortly after this and is delivered by both Godfrey of

61 In illis quae potissimum urgebant preliis non vos pugnasse, sed Christum. GN, p. 186.
62 GM, pp. 154, 156, 185–6, 239–40, 280.
63 AA, p. xxi.
64 AA, p. xxv.
65 AA, p. xxvi.
66 Edgington, 'The *Historia Iherosolimitana*', pp. 8–9, 21–2.
67 AA, p. xxiv.
68 AA, p. xxii, xxvii.
69 AA, p. 106.
70 AA, p. 192.
71 AA, p. 232.

Bouillon and Robert of Flanders.[72] The fifth speech is delivered by an unnamed cleric to besieged crusaders who consider fleeing the city.[73] The sixth speech closely follows the fifth and is delivered again by Godfrey and Robert.[74] The seventh speech is delivered by Adhemar, Godfrey and Robert to the crusaders before the battle against Kerbogha.[75] The eighth and ninth speeches, both delivered by Duke Godfrey, occur during the fighting at Ascalon, one being a heavily theological speech delivered to the prefect of Ramla, the other being an exhortation almost entirely concerned with discouraging looting during battle.[76]

Ralph of Caen

While Ralph of Caen did not participate in the First Crusade, in 1106 he joined the entourage of Bohemond of Taranto during his recruitment tour of France and in 1107 travelled to the Holy Land, perhaps as a chaplain,[77] although his clerical status has been questioned.[78] His connection to the crusading movement was established much earlier however. In his youth Ralph studied at Caen, probably at the cathedral school, under Arnulf of Chocques who would take part in the First Crusade and ultimately rise to be Patriarch of Jerusalem.[79] After serving both Bohemond and then Tancred, until the latter's death in 1112, Ralph sought out his old tutor's patronage. The *Gesta Tancredi* was written around this time, possibly while Ralph was a cathedral canon at Jerusalem before 1118, the year Arnulf died. However, D'Angelo has suggested that the text underwent reworkings between 1113 and the 1130s, possibly by Arnulf or someone inspired by him.[80] The *Gesta Tancredi* or the *Tancredus* is dedicated to Arnulf.[81]

Only extant in a single manuscript, Brussels Bibliothèque Royale 5373, the text has been edited for the *Recueil*, as well as being more recently edited by Edoardo D'Angelo. The narrative covers events from the embarking of the south-Italian Normans on crusade to the siege of Apamea in 1106, ending abruptly. Like Guibert of Nogent, Ralph of Caen's work displays his high level of education and indicates that he was well versed in both the

72 AA, p. 277.
73 AA, pp. 306–8.
74 AA, p. 310.
75 AA, pp. 312–4.
76 AA, p. 460, 466.
77 Natasha Hodgson, 'Reinventing Normans as Crusaders?: Ralph of Caen's *Gesta Tancredi*' in *Anglo Norman Studies 30: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2007*, ed. by Chris P. Lewis (Woodbridge, 2008), p. 117.
78 GT, pp. 3, 55–6, 89.
79 Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade* (Farnham, 2005), p. 1.
80 GT, pp. xxiii–xxxvii.
81 Hodgson, 'Reinventing Normans as Crusaders?', p. 117.

Bible and the classics.[82] Moreover, the personal contact he had with crusade leaders, exaggerated or not, and the time he spent in the newly formed Crusader States meant he was excellently placed to write an account of the First Crusade that is largely original and independent of other narratives.[83]

The *Gesta Tancredi* contains four instances of battle rhetoric. The first occurs during the Battle of Dorylaeum, being delivered by Robert Duke of Normandy to rally Bohemond and his men.[84] The second is delivered by Eberhard of le Puiset during the fighting within Jerusalem.[85] The last two speeches, both of which occur following the capture of Jerusalem, are delivered by Tancred and occur during the fighting around Latakia. The second of Tancred's speeches is cut short where the manuscript ends.[86]

Henry of Huntingdon

In a fashion similar to Orderic, Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon, devotes part of Book VII of his lengthy *Historia Anglorum*, to the story of the First Crusade. However, unlike Orderic who has been argued to have shaped points of the First Crusade narrative specifically so that it might better fit the broader aims of his work,[87] it has been argued that Henry deals with the digression in a hasty and disjointed fashion.[88] Diana Greenway, Henry's modern editor, has argued that the text was developed in six different stages, between 1123–1154. However, the narrative of the First Crusade, written in the first stage (*c.* 1131), underwent no serious revision after this point.[89]

Henry most likely worked from other texts for his account of the crusade, having similarities with the *Gesta* but also with Baldric of Bougueil, Ralph of Caen and William of Malmesbury.[90] His wider work contains a number of significant extended battle orations, only one of which, taking place at the Battle of Dorylaeum and delivered by Robert of Normandy, forms part of his crusade narrative.[91]

Orderic Vitalis

Orderic Vitalis dedicated the ninth book of his *Ecclesiastical History* to telling the story of the First Crusade. Book IX was probably written before

82 Bachrach and Bachrach, *Gesta Tancredi*, pp. 4–5.
83 Hodgson, 'Reinventing Normans as Crusaders?', p. 117.
84 GT, p. 26.
85 GT, p. 110.
86 GT, pp. 120–1, 131.
87 Roach, 'Orderic Vitalis and the First Crusade', pp. 200–1.
88 Partner, *Serious Entertainments,* p. 203.
89 HH, p. xvi–lxxvii.
90 HH, p. xcviii–xcix.
91 HH, p. 427.

Book X, despite the non-sequential authorship of other parts of Orderic's *magnum opus*. It was completed *c.* 1135.[92]

Orderic's account of the First Crusade is largely an epitome of Baldric of Bourgueil. While he adds details of his own, including details of the fighting around Antioch and Jerusalem[93] and is otherwise known to have indulged in epic invention, Orderic neither added to nor developed the battle rhetoric of his source material.[94] His account of the First Crusade includes only a single speech, that of Bohemond to his constable Robert FitzGerard during the Lake Battle.[95] This speech is close, but not identical to, the same speech in Baldric of Bourgueil.[96] Later in his work, while narrating the reign of Baldwin I of Jerusalem, he includes a short oration by the king at Jaffa.[97]

The Monte Cassino Chronicle

As its name indicates, this source, like the *Historia Belli Sacri*, also originated at the Benedictine Abbey of Monte Cassino. It was worked on by a series of authors, notably Leo of Ostia who started the chronicle in 1075 and was likely revised by a monk named Guy, as well as Peter the Deacon until *c.* 1135.[98] The chronicle contains four instances of battle rhetoric,[99] only one of which, a speech at Dorylaeum, is directly relevant to this chapter.[100]

Themes

Martial Virtue

As was discussed in Chapter Two, the work of Bliese ranked appeals to martial or 'chivalric' values as the most prominent rhetorical *topoi* in medieval battle rhetoric. His typology grouped these appeals alongside promises of honour, glory and recognition for displaying such virtues.[101] The nature of battle rhetoric obviously lends itself to such content, which is found in many First Crusade orations. In Robert the Monk's earliest

92 OV, v, pp. xi–xii.
93 OV, p. xvi.
94 OV, p. xviii. Frederick M. Warren, 'The Battle of Fraga and Larchamp in Orderic Vital', *Modern Philology*, 11:3 (1914), pp. 339–346. Frederick M. Warren, 'The enamoured Moslem princess in Orderic Vital and the French Epic', *PMLAA*, 29:3 (1914), pp. 341–58.
95 OV, v, p. 79.
96 BB, pp. 46–7.
97 OV, v, p. 348.
98 Luigi Russo, 'The Monte Cassino Tradition of the First Crusade: From the *Chronica monasterii Casinensis* to the *Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusolymarum*', in *Writing the Early Crusades,* pp. 53–63.
99 MC, pp. 310–11, 505, 506.
100 MC, p. 479.
101 Bliese, 'The Courage of the Normans', p. 3.

harangue Bohemond tells his men, whose morale is wavering outside of the walls of Antioch, that they have been distinguished so far as outstanding soldiers (*bellatores egregii*) and reminds them of their successful record of victory.[102] In Guibert's *Dei Gesta*, at Dorylaeum, Bohemond orders his soldiers to attack the enemy manfully (*viriliter*) and bids them to defend their honour and lives (*honorem pariter vobis vitamque defendite*).[103]

Appeals to martial virtues or the desire for honour and glory were not reserved for instances where battle orations are put into the mouths of lay commanders. Churchmen often deliver speeches that contain these same appeals. In one of Albert of Aachen's orations, delivered by Adhemar of Le Puy during the assault on Antioch, the bishop, seeing 'that the hearts of his men were weak from fear' addresses them saying: 'You should not fear the enemy's attack. Stand firm, rise against these tormenting dogs'.[104]

While such appeals are common throughout the battle rhetoric of First Crusade narratives, there is little development of these ideas when such orations are compared with the *Gesta*. Many speeches that contain martial appeals simply copy, or closely follow, the language of the *Gesta*, such as the first oration in Peter Tudebode.[105] Even when significant attention is given to martial appeals, such as in Baldric's speech delivered by Bohemond at Dorylaeum, the forms they take are generic and undeveloped.[106]

Sweetenham has argued that the *Gesta* makes it clear that participants of the First Crusade were soldiers first and foremost.[107] However, in the previous chapter, it was argued that the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* emphasized the nature of the First Crusade as a venture of spiritual devotion. While appeals to martial virtues, calls for bravery and promises of glory are common in the context of battle rhetoric, their statistical frequency has perhaps been misleading when attempting to understand the nature of battle rhetoric, particularly rhetoric found in crusading narratives. In the previous chapter it was argued that martial appeals, while present, are often couched in religious language, or make reference to the divine. An example from an oration that contains a number of martial appeals is Baldric of Bourgueil's speech, delivered by Bohemond at Dorylaeum:

> Brave soldiers of Christ, see! Now is the time for fighting. Set aside all fear, which can even make men into women, and boldly attend to your own defence. Tirelessly bear the blows of the attacks, and trusting in Jesus as our helper put forth your warlike hands ...[108]

102 RM, p. 39.
103 GN, p. 154.
104 AA, pp. 192–3.
105 PT, p. 52.
106 BB, p. 31.
107 Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 124.
108 BB, p. 31.

Such appeals, which attribute martial virtues to the divine or reinforce them with reference to God or Christ, occur in a number of narratives. Albert of Aachen, in a speech delivered by Godfrey and Robert of Flanders, claims the crusaders were told that escape was impossible, so they should 'stand firm and endure with manly spirit all of your difficulties for Christ'.[109] In the pre-battle sermon of Adhemar of Le Puy in Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolimitana*, a martial appeal is formed from a scriptural quotation of Joshua 10:25, *confortamini et estote viri robusti*.[110]

These instances highlight how even overtly bellicose appeals were incorporated into the wider explanatory framework of the First Crusade, recognizable across a number of distinct narratives. At the heart of this framework was an understanding of the venture as divinely directed. Even military prowess could be understood as a gift from God, a notion that was found in the writings of churchmen from Augustine to Ivo of Chartres,[111] and was presented in the *Gesta* and texts that followed it in a speech by Kerbogha's mother.[112] It was in this way that the martial achievements of the crusaders could be celebrated without contravening the 'controlling principles' of sacred history writing.[113]

As with appeals to martial virtues the public recognition of virtue, usually termed fame and glory, is often found alongside or involves spiritual and religious ideas. In Guibert's *Dei Gesta* a group of crusade leaders, during the fighting at Dorylaeum, tell their soldiers: 'If this is to be your death, the heavenly kingdom and happy destruction awaits you, if you live, if you preserve the faith, certain victory awaits, and after victory glory, after glory greater courage (*audacia*) …'[114] Glory in First Crusade battle rhetoric does not just appear as a consequence of victory. In a Baldric speech delivered at Antioch, Bohemond tells the crusaders: 'For I ask that we do not die as idle men, lacking the desire to fight. Let us not be a reproach or a disgrace to all Christians. If it is our fate to die, let us at least die in war gloriously'.[115]

Like material reward, honour and glory are often presented, or explicitly described, as God-given. In his version of Bohemond's speech to Robert FitzGerard, Guibert has the oration conclude with the line: 'Come therefore, and give your bravery to the suffering Christ now, do not let opportunity find you in a lazy spot, perhaps God prepares to give

109 AA, pp. 310–11.

110 RM, p. 74.

111 'Decretum', in *Sancti Ivonis Carnotensis Episcopi Opera Omnia, PL*, 161, vol 1, 723.

112 GF, p. 56.

113 Simon John, 'Historical Truth and the Miraculous Past: The Use of Oral Evidence in Twelfth-Century Latin Historical Writing on the First Crusade', *English Historical Review*, 130 (2015), p. 264.

114 GN, p. 156.

115 BB, p. 45.

glory (*honor*) to you'.[116] Likewise, honour and glory are often represented as going hand in hand with fame which, although it does not appear as a motive appeal in battle rhetoric, is presented by Guibert in *Dei Gesta* as being Christ-given rather than earned by anyone for his own actions.[117]

In this fashion, authors of the First Crusade narratives used their battle orations as a way of reconciling the theological underpinnings of the expedition as they wished to portray it, as well as the commandment of Urban that men should travel to the East for the love of Christ rather than for wealth or glory, with the desires familiar to an audience with first-hand experience of warfare and the campaigns of the First Crusade specifically. Thus, appeals to martial virtues and promises of glory, rather than being dichotomous with the devotional and spiritually righteous essence of the crusade are reinforced by reference to it.

Another example of this combination of appeals that have previously been understood dichotomously as bellicose or spiritual comes from Baldric's version of Bohemond's speech to Robert FitzGerard, closely followed in Orderic Vitalis. In both speeches, Robert is called on to fight bravely in support of his fellow Christians.[118] Similarly, when discussing the antonym of honour and glory, shame, whose relevance to an understanding of lay aristocratic culture is highlighted by its prominence in vernacular battle rhetoric,[119] Latin authors direct the appeal to a religious end. Rather than being deployed in relation to the identity of a kin-group or *gens*, Baldric has Bohemond express concern for the reputation of Christians and the Christian faith.[120]

Often found alongside martial appeals that are free from other religious reinforcement is the exhortation of the crusaders as *milites Christi*, who are described as courageous in some way. Baldric's first battle oration, in a manner similar to the *Gesta*, begins, '*fortissimi Christi milites*',[121] which is likewise the opening of the Dorylaeum oration in the *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*.[122] Following the example of the *Gesta*, speeches written as taking place at Dorylaeum frequently highlight the special status of *milites*, knights as opposed to foot-soldiers, who are usually referred to as *pedites*. It is his own knights that Bohemond, in *Dei Gesta*, addresses when he says: 'go together, and defend your honour and life', concluding his harangue with 'and you, infantry, extend out the tents carefully'.[123] Similarly, in Peter Tudebode's *Historia* Bohemond's oration at Dorylaeum is rendered: 'My

116 GN, p. 188.
117 GN, p. 150.
118 Bliese, 'The Just War as Concept and Motive', pp. 11–14. BB, pp. 46–7. OV, p. 79.
119 Bliese, 'Fighting Spirit and Literary Genre', pp. 422–3.
120 BB, p. 45.
121 BB, p. 31.
122 MC, p. 479.
123 GN, p. 154.

lords and most valorous Christian soldiers! It is obvious that we are surrounded and are confronted with a difficult battle. Therefore, the entire force of knights shall advance courageously against the enemy while the footmen prepare the defences skilfully and hastily'.[124] As Chapter Two argued, the history of the notion of the *milites Christi*, as well as its previous deployment by ecclesiastical authorities in the eleventh century in particular highlighted the special status of this sanctified knighthood.

The understanding of this status is reflected in many First Crusade battle orations. Not only are crusaders frequently referred to as *milites Christi* but the place of *milites* in Christian society is dealt with in Baldric of Bourgueil's second oration, delivered by Bohemond outside of Antioch. In this long harangue, the central theme of which is Christian unity, Bohemond tells his men:

> How does a lord differ from servant, a noble from a plebeian, a rich man from a poor man, a knight from an infantryman, unless the advice of those of us in power is of use to them, and ensures that they have help? If the Turks rule over me with impunity, I no longer want to live. You, ruling lords and famous men, the light and flower of victorious France, the glory and light of a powerful army, you must fight for yourselves and lay down your lives for your brothers.[125]

This nuanced exhortation defines knighthood in contrast to the foot soldier and emphasizes the demands of Christian love and charity that a true *miles Christi* must be ready to answer. These obligations are made all the more forceful for their expression in wording strongly reminiscent of John 15:13.[126] Such an emphasis on charity is also part of Albert of Aachen's battle rhetoric. At Antioch Godfrey and Robert of Flanders remind their men 'that it is the charity of God to lay down one's life for one's friends'.[127]

These instances illustrate that the deployment of the ideal of the *miles Christi* is, like other examples of seemingly martial rhetorical *topoi*, better understood as one element of a richer construction of crusading warfare, which whether experienced directly or not had clear moral and didactic aims towards the fighting men who were the audiences of battle rhetoric, narratively speaking. As with the orations of the *Gesta*, the essence of much First Crusade battle rhetoric is a devotional spirituality which crucially allowed arms-bearers to continue to practise their profession. Fulcher makes this clear when he has Urban contrast those soldiers fighting for eternal reward,

124 PT, p. 52. Hill and Hill, *Peter Tudebode*, p. 34.
125 BB, p. 45.
126 maiorem hac dilectionem nemo habet ut animam suam quis ponat pro amicis suis.
127 AA, p. 277.

with 'those who have been hirelings for a few pieces of silver',[128] an obvious scriptural allusion with damning connotations.

As the previous chapter described, the vocation of the *miles Christi* was presented as one that was as valid or almost as valid as that of the monk, his combat with material evil paralleling the spiritual combat against the forces of the Devil in which professed religious engaged.[129] This association of the warriors of the First Crusade with the monastic life is exemplified in the *Gesta*'s longest battle oration, in which Bohemond tells Robert FitzGerard: 'You know in truth that this is no war of the flesh, but of the spirit'.[130] This understanding of the vocation of a *miles Christi* to fight a spiritual battle[131] is echoed in the final battle oration of Baldric of Bourgueil:

> The enemy that we see denies us this city, but an enemy that we do not see occupies the paths leading to it. Against them our battle is a spiritual one. And it is a more serious matter for us to struggle against spiritual evils in heaven than to fight against flesh and blood that we can see. Those who are muttering in this little place are the limbs of those spiritual evils, and they are inferior to and more stupid than their masters. If these people, who are almost nothing, will be able to defeat us and to take from us this city that we see, what do you think their masters will do, when their slaves dare to do so much? Certainly, we must be afraid that the heavenly city may be closed to us and may be taken away from us, if our home is removed from us in our idleness by its evil hosts. We shall be timid and ineffectual in the spiritual battle if we do not rise up against these weak dogs, who cannot even bark, effeminate and defenceless, full of fear for whatever death they may suffer.[132]

In this oration, Baldric develops further the notion found in the *Gesta Francorum* that the crusade was not a war of the flesh but a war of the spirit, arguing that the physical war is subordinate to, and yet must be fought in order to proceed with, the spiritual war.

It is, of course, far from the case that all bellicose motivational appeals appear with religious or spiritual reference. Where such instances occur, they are often not simply for the praise of unidentified crusaders, frequently serving the author's purposes in other ways. A good example of this is the short speech delivered by Hugh the Great during the final encounter at

128 FC, p. 136. Fink, *Fulcher of Chartres*, p. 67.

129 Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 9.

130 GF, p. 37.

131 Cf. Sini Kangas, 'Deus Vult: Violence and Suffering as a Means of Salvation during the First Crusade', in *Medieval History Writing and Crusading Ideology*, ed. by Tuomas M. S. Lehtonen and Kurt Villads Jensen (Helsinki, 2005), p. 165.

132 BB, pp. 108.

Antioch against Kerbogha: 'Men, battle runs away from us - do let us look for it and go to the famous commander Bohemond. That is where the battle is that you want and where the well-armed enemy can be found'.[133] Here Hugh is portrayed in a way that displays his bravery and his confidence in himself and his soldiers. Moreover, this passage associates Hugh, whose crusade career would ultimately be marred by his departure after Antioch, with the heroic Bohemond. Robert takes a number of other measures to sanitize the career of Hugh of Vermandois, and to integrate him into the high group of crusade leaders.[134] James Naus has attributed this account of Hugh's participation on the First Crusade, including the probable intended deception in describing Hugh's death, to the threat posed to the significance of the abbey of Rheims, as the provider of royal sanctity and legitimacy, by Louis VI's coronation at Orleans in 1108.[135]

The praise of heroics, however, need not be explicitly political. Henry of Huntingdon renders an oration at Doryaelum that is constituted solely of practical warnings against the utility of flight, as well as calls for bravery. This is in sharp contrast to the majority of First Crusade rhetoric, though very much in line with Henry's other orations. The valorization of Robert of Normandy was evidently not hampered by his subsequent defeat and imprisonment at the hands of his brother, and his words are even given the classical stylings of Virgil and Lucan.[136]

That martial appeals, particularly those that are delivered without religious reference, are downplayed in many of the battle orations of First Crusade narratives can be explained by the didactic purposes of many of these narratives. These purposes are often part of the broader explanatory frameworks of victory or defeat, for example when Fulcher writes of the disasters that befall the crusaders when men 'trust too much in their own excellence' rather than in God.[137] With a central message of a number of First Crusade narratives being that God worked through the crusaders to bring them victory, failure was attributed to sin and wicked intentions. Given the presentation of the notion that men in victory boast of their own virtues rather than glorifying God as transgressive,[138] the comparative lack and underdevelopment of themes celebratory of martial virtue in First Crusade narratives becomes easier to understand. This is not to argue for a strong martial/religious dichotomy of these narratives, but rather to highlight their devotional and didactic essence that saw the

133 RM, p. 170.

134 James Naus, 'The *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Robert the Monk and the Coronation of Louis VI', in *Writing the Early Crusades*, p. 108.

135 Naus, 'The *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Robert the Monk', p. 112.

136 HH, p. 427.

137 FC, pp. 433–40. Fink, *Fulcher of Chartres,* pp. 166–8.

138 FC, pp. 261–2. Fink, *Fulcher of Chartres,* p. 204.

development of virtue as the result of the crusaders fulfilling the penitential demands of their vows.

Material Reward

Like appeals to martial virtues, the promise of material reward is ranked highly among Bliese's categories of common *topoi*.[139] A cursory survey of the instances wherein the promise of wealth appears as a motivational appeal in battle orations from First Crusade sources would seem to conflict with Urban's decree that the crusaders should travel to the East not out of a desire for riches or glory but for love. This understanding of the crusade was developed by authors such as Guibert of Nogent, who described the 'new and incomparable victory of the expedition to Jerusalem' as being completed by men who were not driven by a desire for fame, money or territorial expansion.[140]

Despite instances wherein appeals to martial reward are utilized, the attainment of riches is far from a prominent theme of First Crusade orations or their wider narratives. When Guibert of Nogent penned an instance in which Bohemond's men looted residents of Anatolia, he was clear that pillaging was only the result of trade being refused.[141] This may have been a more significant point to make given that the victims were Eastern Christians. Narratives of the First Crusade do of course contain numerous references to the crusaders seizing plunder without shame from Muslim enemies.[142] This is unsurprising given the nature of medieval warfare and particularly the peculiarity of the crusading expedition, to say nothing of the fact that all armies march on their stomachs, a reality that would have been appreciated by an audience with first-hand experience of warfare. Guibert details the relief that spoils, particularly in the form of livestock, bring to the crusaders following an encounter with the enemy.[143] Moreover, it seems to have been well understood by authors that spoils were the glue that held the crusading expedition together, in part through bonds of service. In the *Gesta Tancredi*, the titular hero is described as being so wealthy that 'no one who fought for him was in want'.[144]

For the most part, when material reward is deployed in First Crusade battle rhetoric, it is contrasted with the more favourable motivational appeal of heavenly reward. Adhemar of Le Puy's pre-battle sermon in Robert the Monk provides a strong example of this formulation:

139 Bliese, 'Courage of the Normans', p. 3.
140 GN, p. 82.
141 GN, pp. 138–9.
142 Cf. RM, p. 78, p. 90, GT, p. 89. OV, v, p. 45, p. 117.
143 GN, p. 158.
144 GT, p. 12. Bachrach and Bachrach, *Gesta Tancredi*, p. 29.

> No misfortune can touch you. The man who dies here will be happier than he who lives because he will receive eternal joy in place of his mortal life. Conversely the man who survives will triumph over his enemies in victory; he will gain their riches and not suffer any need. You know what you have suffered, and the situation you now face. The Lord has brought the riches of the Orient right up to you - in fact, put them in your hands.[145]

Similar contrasting formulations of this appeal are found in both Baldric and Albert.[146]

As is the case in the *Gesta Francorum*, in which the battle oration at Dorylaeum includes a promise of wealth that is God-given,[147] when material reward appears as a motivator and is not contrasted with heavenly reward, it is still presented with religious reinforcement. This is the case in Peter Tudebode, who follows the same speech in the *Gesta Francorum* closely, promising God-given riches.[148] This depiction of spoils as divinely provided is not restricted to battle rhetoric. Robert the Monk describes how, following a battle, 'those who were poor were suddenly made rich with the help of God'.[149] Later First Crusade narratives thus display a clear development in regard to the appeal of wealth, beyond the notion of plunder as God-given. Not only are extended instances of this appeal frequently subordinated to an ideal central to the crusade as holy war, authors also often go to great lengths to involve the taking of spoils in the aforementioned explanatory framework that was heavily concerned with the motives and intentions of participants.

Albert of Aachen's account of the First Crusade contains a clear emphasis on the risks, both spiritual and physical, of plundering, and specifically counsels against battlefield looting. Following the victory of Antioch, Albert associates the seizing of spoils with avarice and corruption.[150] At the Battle of Ascalon, Albert writes that the lure of plunder was a tactic used by the enemy to bait Christians into danger, and claims that battlefield looting was forbidden on pain of excommunication.[151] Moreover, in a somewhat atypical piece of battle rhetoric during the same action, Duke Godfrey recognized that the pursuit of plunder was sending Christians into danger, and addressed them thus:

> O rebellious and incorrigible men, who has bewitched you, that your hand is turned to forbidden and illicit plunder, before our enemy, with

145 RM, p. 74. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 169.
146 BB, p. 45. AA, p. 277.
147 GF, p. 20.
148 PT, p. 53.
149 RM, p. 28. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk,* p. 112.
150 AA, pp. 335–7.
151 AA, p. 459.

> God's help, has fallen to the sword? Alas! Leave off looting, resist the enemy and do not give way now to those who are rising up and looking for bitter vengeance on you.[152]

That the theme of greed was a particular preoccupation for Albert can be seen from its recurrence throughout his *Historia*, Book XII of which concludes with the story of an unsuccessful raid in which a number of Christians are captured. This is explained by Albert as occurring because the raiders were greedy for plunder on a holy day.[153] However, Albert was not the only oration author to write about the dangers of battlefield looting. Guibert wrote of wealth being used by the enemy to tempt men away from the crusader army.[154] Likewise, Ralph of Caen relates a story in the *Gesta Tancredi* where crusaders hungry for spoils pursue the enemy rather than supporting their allies and are ultimately captured. Ralph is clear in his expression of the irony that men recklessly chasing spoils had become spoils themselves.[155]

This broader concern regarding the consequences of greed, which intertwined spiritual and non-spiritual elements, certainly did not have its origins in the crusading movement. Churchmen as far back as Augustine, writing on what kind of warfare could ever be considered just in a Christian context, condemned wars fought for plunder.[156] That there was no ideological distinction between the divinely directed nature of the crusade, the behaviour (particularly in regards to discipline and cohesion) of its participants and the taking and distribution of wealth during the campaign is exemplified in the *Gesta Tancredi*, where a heavenly vision instructs a nobleman named Anselm that in order for him to be the recipient of heavenly reward he must be sure to pay the men in his service.[157] The efficient and virtuous ways in which Tancred utilized or spurned wealth during the crusade are detailed throughout the text.[158]

It is clear then that material wealth as a motive appeal was not antithetical to the representation of the First Crusade that early commentators were keen to convey. It is decried only in moments wherein greed threatens the unity and discipline of the crusaders on the battlefield, where unity was most desperately needed. The importance of paying soldiers their wages in

152 AA, p. 467.
153 AA, p. 879.
154 GN, pp. 335–6.
155 GT, pp. 26–7.
156 Frederick H. Russell, *Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1975), p. 26.
157 GT, pp. 90–1.
158 GT, pp. 11–12, 22–3, 50–1.

order to combat greed and the risk of a disruption to discipline was expressed in a homily of Maximus of Turin, as well as being attributed to Augustine.[159] As it is presented in Robert the Monk's speech by Adhemar of Le Puy,[160] or in Guibert's version of Count Raymond's speech at Jerusalem,[161] the promise of wealth complements, usually in a subordinate fashion, the central devotional spirituality on display, rather than being dissonant with it. In the *Gesta Tancredi*, spoils are described as the prize of victory,[162] and as victory is God-given, so too is plunder. Nevertheless, promises of wealth are not a frequent motivational appeal in early twelfth-century sources of the First Crusade, appearing only once in a closely copied speech in Peter Tudebode,[163] and not at all in Fulcher of Chartres or Albert of Aachen.

Gentes and *nationes*

Despite ranking lower in his survey of rhetorical *topoi*, what Bliese categorized as appeals to 'national' or 'racial' identities appear much more frequently than promises of wealth in battle orations from First Crusade narratives. This typology is, however, particularly unhelpful in regard to these appeals, distinguishing 'national' and 'racial' reputation and 'traditions of victory' as separate *topoi* among his sixteen categories.[164] That these rhetorical devices are clearly discernible from one another can be called into question. The first battle oration in Robert the Monk contains a good example of both of these appeals: 'Yet to what race has God granted the privilege of fighting so many battles, beating so many terrible enemies, enriching themselves with so much spoil from races and being crowned with the palms of so many triumphs?'[165] Similarly, Bohemond's Dorylaeum speech, found in Baldric's *Historia*, includes an appeal to the racial reputation of the Franks, with Bohemond saying: 'I beg you, let not the praise of the Franks be defiled because of our negligence …' Shortly after, in the same speech, the Franks are described as an unbeatable people (*genus infractum*), an undefeated nation (*gens inuictissima*).[166]

Moreover, precisely what was understood by terms which are often rendered in modern English as 'race' and 'nation', is not always evident. The

159 Homilia CXIV.' *in Sancti Maximi episcopi taurinensis Opera omnia, PL*, 57, pp. 517–19. Cf. 'Epistola CXXXVIII'. in *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Opera Omnia post Lovaniensium Theologorum Recensionem, PL*, 33, vol 2, 525–35.

160 RM, p. 74.

161 GN, p. 280.

162 GT, p. 9.

163 PT, p. 53.

164 Bliese, 'Courage of the Normans', p. 4.

165 RM, p. 39. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 126.

166 BB, p. 31.

medieval world has been described as a world of peoples (*gentes*, *populi* or *nationes*),[167] a concept which, rather than always reflecting reality, required careful cultivation through shared histories, myth, language and customs.[168] These communities of people were biblically ordained, with Jeremiah 1:10 explaining 'Lo, I have set thee this day over the nations (*gentes*), and over the kingdoms (*regna*), to root up, and pull down, and to waste, and to destroy, and to build, and to plant'.[169] Moreover, in the medieval mind, such groups were associated by common descent, lineage, ancestry and shared innate characteristics.[170]

Despite the number of distinct identifiable *gentes* that took part in the First Crusade,[171] authors largely describe the crusaders as Franks or sometimes Gauls,[172] and no battle orations describe the crusaders as any nationality other than these. The domination of northern France on the historiography of the First Crusade[173] is evident in many aspects of contemporary Latin narratives, and battle rhetoric clearly reflects this historiographical tradition, making much of the *Franci* and Frankish achievement. Baldric of Bourgueil refers to the crusaders as 'the light and flower of a victorious France'[174] in an otherwise largely theologically driven oration delivered by Bohemond at Antioch. Moreover, Baldric adds a similar appeal to a speech modelled on an example found in the *Gesta*, the speech to Robert FitzGerard. In Baldric's version, Bohemond tells his constable: 'Remember, I beg you, your ancestors, and do not in any way tarnish the glowing reputation of the French'.[175] Orderic Vitalis also reproduces this oration alone of all the orations in Baldric's work.[176] Likewise, despite the fact that Tudebode follows many of the *Gesta*'s orations very closely he too adds material to this speech, which is concerned with ancestral bellicosity, with Robert FitzGerard in Tudebode's *Historia* being told; 'Remember the wisdom of antiquity, the bravery of your forebears, and above all, how they made war'.[177] The imperative to remember (*memor esto*/

167 For these terms see Susan Reynolds, 'Medieval *Origines Gentium* and the Community of the Realm', *History* 68 (1983), p. 375, 383.

168 Explored in Ralph H. C. Davies, 'The peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100–1400', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6th ser., 4–7 (1994–7).

169 ecce constitui te hodie super gentes et super regna ut evellas et destruas et disperdas et dissipes et aedifices et plantes.

170 Alan V. Murray, 'National Identity, Language and Conflict in the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1096–1192', in *The Crusades and the Near East: Cultural Histories*, ed. by Conor Kostick (London, 2010), p. 110.

171 FC, p. 203.

172 Hodgson, 'Reinventing Normans as Crusaders?', p. 119.

173 Bull, 'The Historiographical Construction', *Haskins Society Journal*, pp. 35–6.

174 BB, p. 45.

175 BB, p. 46.

176 OV, v, 79.

177 PT, p. 72. Hill and Hill, *Peter Tudebode*, p. 51.

recordare), in the earlier examples, displays forcefully how the First Crusade was incorporated by authors into an extended view of history wherein the Franks remained centre-stage. Elsewhere in his work, Robert relates the First Crusade and the Franks to the Carolingian past, comparing the expedition with Charlemagne's legendary pilgrimage to Jerusalem.[178] Robert is not the only author to do this, and Guibert similarly crafts a panegyric for his people that recalls their pre-Merovingian accomplishments.[179] That such notions would resonate among political elites across the Frankish world is not difficult to imagine.[180]

The fact that the battle rhetoric of First Crusade narratives focuses almost exclusively upon 'Franks' is best understood not only as the result of the number of authors who hailed from or worked in northern France, but also because of the number of crusader princes who were or could be easily identified as Franks.[181] Guibert, for example, claimed the south-Italian Norman Bohemond as a Frank due to his marriage.[182] Likewise, Robert attributes Bohemond's positive attributes to French ancestry, with his vices being blamed on his Apulian mother.[183] Albert of Aachen, however, had no problems identifying Bohemond as a Norman.[184] It would also fall to Albert, as well as other German authors such as Ekkehard of Aura, to attempt to reclaim Godfrey of Bouillon in the wake of his gallicization in the majority of First Crusade narratives.[185]

The identification of distinct *gentes* with particular inherent traits, seen in the *Gesta Francorum*, is thus developed in later First Crusade narratives by its direct involvement in battle rhetoric, wherein the virtues of the crusaders, and the focal point of their *gentes*, the crusade princes, are invoked through direct speech at climactic moments. Moreover, as Chapter Two argued, the relationship between the Franks and the Turks served to highlight the commonality of these two *gentes*, in order to underpin the characteristic which best distinguished them, that being the faith of the Franks. In later accounts of the First Crusade, this aspect of the *Gesta*'s narrative would be directly employed in battle rhetoric, serving to present the Franks as the chosen people of God. This notion is stated by Robert the Monk early in his *prologus*, when he describes the crusaders as 'blessed nation of the Franks whose God is the LORD; and the people

178 RM, p. 6.
179 Robert Levine (trans.), *The Deeds of God through the Franks: A Translation of Guibert de Nogent's 'Gesta Dei per Francos* (Woodbride, 1997).
180 Murray, 'National Identity', p. 112.
181 Bull, 'Historiographical Construction', p. 36.
182 GN, p. 106.
183 RM, p. 92.
184 AA, p. 95.
185 Bull, 'Historiographical Construction', pp. 54–5.

he has chosen for his inheritance',[186] and is repeated in his earliest battle speech, when Bohemond asks to which other race has God granted so many victories.[187] Similarly, Albert of Aachen, in battle oration delivered by an unnamed priest, presents the crusaders as a race 'which has been dedicated to God', who, 'left everything for the love of God …'[188] and in a later oration as 'most Christian men, and you who are the flower of Gaul'.[189]

Thus, as with martial appeals and appeals to material wealth, references to the deeds or traits of *gentes* were involved by authors as part of a broader explanatory framework which shaped the story of the First Crusade. Traditions of victory were utilized as traditions of faithfulness and devotion. When the crusaders struggle, it is often explained as the withdrawal of God's favour on account of their sins.[190] This extends the metaphor of the Franks as new Israelites and mirrors the tribulations the Israelites suffered for their transgressions in the Old Testament, which in turn reflects the understanding of the crusade as requiring righteousness and proper intentions on the part of the crusaders.

Through their widespread utilization by oration authors, it is clear that appeals to the identity, ancestry and achievements of a *gens* could be powerful notions. Not all oration authors made use of such ideals in the same way, however, and there is evident variance even among First Crusade narratives. Of all the sources this chapter is concerned with, the *Gesta Tancredi* is most atypical in its use of such appeals. Firstly, Ralph utilizes these appeals in his battle rhetoric to draw attention to Norman, as well as Frankish, achievement on the First Crusade. Ralph's earliest orations, taking place at Dorylaeum, is unlike any other speech recorded as occurring during that encounter. Instead of being given by Bohemond, the harangue is delivered by Robert, Duke of Normandy, in order to rally the fleeing Bohemond. He does so, according to Ralph, because he remembered (*memor*) his lineage and its bellicose nature before removing his helmet and shouting 'Normandy', in the fashion of an epic.[191] While Robert in his speech to Bohemond names the latter's home as Apulia (and specifically Otranto), Ralph does not explicitly appeal to an idea of Norman virtues or past victories in the oration itself. Ralph's ideas of Norman identity and his concern for the reputation of the Normans come across instead through Ralph's discussion of Tancred's ancestry, through his shaming of Norman deserters at Antioch, the recounting of Norman military achievements and by emphasizing William the Carpenter's Frankish nature.[192] This is not to

186 RM, p. 4. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 76.
187 RM, p. 39.
188 AA, pp. 106–7.
189 AA, pp. 232–3.
190 FC, pp. 222–3.
191 GT, p. 26.
192 Hodgson, 'Reinventing Normans as Crusaders?', pp. 119–31.

say that Ralph did not concern himself with the reputation of the Franks. In another speech without any textual precedent, Ralph has Eberhard le Puiset, during the fighting inside of Jerusalem, deliver the following harangue:

> Alas for Francia! Alas for such a shameful retreat! For shame! Did we come to fight or run? Boys are accustomed to engage in battle such as this. Girls accustomed to root for the clash of arms. Indeed there are often threatening blows in the midst of feasts. Are you men of Francia? I do not think it dignified to give the name of French women to you who have feared to break these sheep pens and to slaughter the flock held within! Shake off your fear. Demonstrate the manliness of your homeland. I shall take up the first banner, let others follow me.[193]

Similarly, Ralph claims a Frankish soldier as being the equal of one hundred Greeks.[194] Moreover, he describes the Battle of Dorylaeum as *audacia Gallica* fighting on though surrounded on all sides[195] and, before the final battle at Antioch against Kerbogha, claims that the bold *Galliae pectora* prepared themselves for war.[196] As positively as Ralph writes about the Franks, and more subtly of Normans, he had no such concern for the men of Languedoc, describing them as unwarlike and weak.[197]

However, the reputation of *gentes* is not the only collective identity that features in the battle rhetoric of First Crusade narratives. Baldric, for example, includes appeals concerned with the reputation of Christians. Following calls in his earliest oration to 'let not the praise of the Franks be defiled because of our negligence', he follows this notion by having Bohemond warn 'let not the name of Christians be reviled because of our idleness'.[198] Later in that same speech, Baldric presents Christians in the fashion of a *gens* when Bohemond calls for them to 'run forward and defend yourselves and your country'.[199] Similarly, in Baldric's second oration, Bohemond tells the crusaders 'let us not be a reproach or a disgrace to all Christians'.[200] This collective Christian identity is also central to Baldric's final speech:

> For as long as those evil judges, the accomplices of Herod and Pilate, insult and afflict your brothers, they also crucify Christ. While they torment and kill them, they also thrust the spear into the side of Christ

193 GT, p. 110. Bachrach and Bachrach, *Gesta Tancredi*, p. 147.
194 GT, p. 9.
195 GT, p. 30.
196 GT, p. 73.
197 GT, p. 58.
198 BB, p. 31.
199 BB, p. 31.
200 BB, p. 45.

with Longinus. They do all these things, and what is worse they deride and reproach Christ himself and our law, and they provoke us with intemperate words. So what do you do? Is it right that you should hear these things and see these things and not groan? I speak to you as fathers, sons, brothers and grandchildren. If some foreigner strikes one of your people, will you not avenge your blood?[201]

Here battle rhetoric provides a vehicle for the notion that the crusaders were all members of Christ's family, the *familia Christi*. Biddlecombe argues that this speech serves as a confirmation of the ideas preached by Urban at the beginning of the expedition, and that the representation of the Christians both Latin and Eastern, as one family, played on obligations that the medieval aristocracy would have well understood. These included communal defence, the importance of protecting property and the idea that vengeance was the required answer to wrongs done to kinsmen.[202] The use of ideas of *familia* in battle rhetoric extend beyond Baldric, however. Adhemar's pre-battle sermon in Robert the Monk begins:

All of us who were baptized into Jesus Christ[203] are both sons of God and brothers together: we are bound by one and the same spiritual link and by the same love. So let us fight together in common purpose, like brothers, to protect our souls and bodies in such desperate straits.[204]

Likewise, in three instances in Albert of Aachen's battle rhetoric, the crusaders are called brothers,[205] and in Baldric's second oration Bohemond specifically tells his men that they must be willing to lay down their lives for their brothers.[206] The description of the crusaders as brothers in battle rhetoric is best understood, not only in the context of lay culture with its emphasis on familial bonds, but on the devotional spirituality of the crusading movement.[207] Moreover, the reference to baptism in Adhemar's oration perhaps reflects the idea that taking up the cross of Christ was a second kind of baptism, marking repentance and a break from the old.[208] These instances also naturally emphasize the theme of Christian unity on the crusade. As with the earlier examples from Robert and Baldric, two of the instances in which the term *fratres* appears in

201 BB, p. 109.
202 Biddlecombe, 'Baldric of Bourgueil and the *Familia Christi*', pp. 20–21.
203 Romans 6:3.
204 RM, p. 74. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk,* p. 170.
205 AA, pp. 306, 310, 314.
206 BB, p. 45.
207 Jonathan Riley-Smith, 'Crusading as an Act of Love', *History*, 65 (1980), p. 190.
208 Kane, *Impact*, p. 54.

battle rhetoric in Albert are concerned with encouraging the Franks not to abandon their fellows on the battlefield.[209]

The crucial theme of unity will be discussed in further detail later in this chapter, but it is worth noting here that the obvious priority of oration authors to present the crusaders as victorious in their unity likely accounts in part for the absence of references to *gentes* other than the Franks in battle rhetoric. Like crusading princes who hailed from outside of northern France, their soldiers were likewise co-opted as Franks and the deeds, achievements and traits of the Franks were often applied to them in the immediacy of combat through battle rhetoric.

Thus, the distinctive *gentes* who took the road to the Holy Sepulchre came to be defined as a *gens* whose outstanding feature was their devotion to God. This unity in faith was commented on in verse almost a century later by Roger of Howden when he wrote: 'They march towards the East bearing the Cross, and taking all of the West with them: they led an army diverse in languages, rites, customs and manners, but one which is fervent in faith'.[210]

Divine Aid

It is unsurprising that the battle rhetoric of First Crusade narratives makes considerable use of appeals to divine aid, which is ranked second most common in Bliese's typology.[211] However, the form which these appeals take in narratives of the First Crusade varies considerably. In the first place, there are numerous instances in which speakers make a straightforward promise that God is with or will bring aid or victory to the crusaders in an approaching encounter with the enemy. Adhemar concludes his pre-battle sermon in Robert the Monk's *Historia* by telling the crusaders to 'march out against them in the Name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and may our all-powerful Lord God be with you'.[212] Similarly, Baldric's oration delivered by one amongst a group of priests before the siege of Jerusalem includes the promise that 'God himself, your leader, will give you help in this battle and the reward of good will and glorious action'.[213] In Albert of Aachen, a harangue at Dorylaeum ends with a call for the crusaders to, without hesitation, 'attack these enemies who oppose the living God, and by God's gift you will achieve victory this day'.[214] In many instances, this appeal is part of the conclusion of a speech. In another speech by Albert of Aachen, Adhemar concludes with the appeal

209 AA, p. 310, 314.
210 RH, iii, p. 38. Murray, 'National Identity', p. 121.
211 Bliese, 'Courage of the Normans', p. 4.
212 RM, p. 74. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 169.
213 BB, p. 109.
214 AA, pp. 106–7.

that: 'For now, today God will fight for you'.[215] This reflects a common rhetorical feature of battle orations wherein a speech is concluded with what should be seen to be the most crucial appeal.

Appeals to divine aid vary greatly in their details. While Robert the Monk and Baldric of Bourgueil have their most theologically complex harangues delivered by clerics, speeches given by laymen, be they commanders or otherwise, do not shy away from promising assistance from heaven. In one of Fulcher's orations, God himself delivers this appeal, declaring in a vision: 'Let their hope in Me be constant, and I shall make them triumph over the Turk'.[216] As this chapter has already demonstrated, divine aid is also often presented alongside appeals to martial virtues, and material reward is frequently contrasted with divine reward in battle orations. Similarly, when Bohemond, in his speech at Dorylaeum recounted by Baldric, calls the Franks unbeatable he is able to say this because God is with them.[217]

In other examples of this appeal, reference to supernatural agents of the divine are not uncommon. In Baldric of Bourgueil's version of Bohemond's speech to Robert FitzGerard, after instructing his constable to maintain the reputation of the Franks, Bohemond reassures Robert that 'there will be help for us immediately from heaven'.[218] This appeal is also repeated in very similar language by Orderic Vitalis.[219] Even greater detail is provided in Adhemar's sermon in Robert's work, wherein the bishop promises:

> God is sending the legions of his saints to avenge you on your enemies. You will see them today with your own eyes: when you do, do not be afraid of the terrifying noise they make. Indeed you should be used to the sight of them, since they have already come to your aid once; but human eyes do quail at the sight of citizens of heaven.[220]

Similarly, in Albert of Aachen, it is specified that angelic power will protect the crusaders from harm.[221]

In such examples, divine aid is presented as being more significant than any other factor prior to an encounter with the enemy. A strong example of this occurs in Albert of Aachen, in which a speech delivered by Duke Godfrey, Robert of Flanders and Adhemar of Le Puy, after detailing the desperate situation the crusaders are in, reassures the Franks by explaining that God is powerful enough to deliver them from the hands of

215 AA, pp. 192–3.
216 FC, p. 246. Fink, *Fulcher of Chartres*, p. 102.
217 BB, p. 31.
218 BB, pp. 46–7.
219 OV, v, p. 79.
220 RM, p. 74. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 169.
221 AA, p. 460.

the enemy.[222] Other examples, found in the works of Ralph and Albert, are expressed in the language of Deuteronomy 32:20.[223]

These instances reflect the most significant theme of First Crusade battle rhetoric, namely that the success of the crusade was directly attributable to God. This is perhaps most visible in Guibert of Nogent's *Dei Gesta per Francos*. In Guibert's battle rhetoric, the example of this notion *par excellence* is the oration by Bohemond during the fighting around Antioch in which he tells his men:

> Up to now you have warred against the faithless for the faith and from among all dangers you have emerged happy. Having often experienced evidence of Christ's strength (*fortitudo*) you should already delight and you should certainly know that in the most pressing battles it is not you who have fought, but Christ. What foolishness of despair therefore can creep into your strong mind before an attack, you who have escaped evils that have never been seen before, who with God's support, have come to triumphs impossible for men to reach? Only now, I beseech you, advance with your faith which has been proven, so that in turn no human strength can resist you, Thus, make secure your minds, proceed with caution, and your Christ, who carries your banners as usual, you should now seek with all the sharpness of your mind, and ensure you call out to him.[224]

This notion sits at the heart of the broader explanatory framework constructed by First Crusade narrative authors. That victory is presented as being given by God, and consequently, that when the crusaders suffer setbacks or failures it is attributed to their lack of faith or sinfulness, is not only advanced by Fulcher of Chartres. It is mirrored in Robert the Monk when he depicts the Saracens as losing faith in their god after they are defeated in battle, a notion common to *chansons de geste*.[225] The crusaders' opponents, rather than seeing defeat and suffering as the necessary and just correction of sin, abandon their conviction, illustrating the superiority of the crusaders on both a physical and spiritual level. Moreover, while a number of orations which feature promises of divine aid, written both prior to and after 1095, are preceded by descriptions of the army partaking in Christian rites in order to be reconciled with God before battle,[226] most First Crusade battle orations do not, the righteousness of their cause and endurance of hardship as

222 AA, p. 313.
223 GT, p. 131. Bachrach and Bachrach, *Gesta Tancredi*, p. 173. AA, pp. 232–3.
224 GN, pp. 185–6.
225 RM, pp. 107–8. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 25.
226 Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausability', pp. 1–17.

penance evidently being sufficient. In this regard, an oration in Fulcher's *Historia* directly relates God's help to the repentance of the crusaders.[227]

Thus, although the continual attribution of success in battle to God may appear to cast the crusaders in an inactive role, the gaining and maintenance of divine favour required continual activity. Through battle rhetoric authors could display how crusading piety was not passive, but vigorously practised. Nevertheless, it is difficult to overstate how essential divine direction was thought to be to the nature of the First Crusade, particularly for authors such as Guibert of Nogent. While divine aid is a common notion in non-crusading orations, authors such as Guibert were eager to represent the campaigns of the First Crusade as being set apart from the 'needless wars' of the West, where soldiers were driven by pride and cupidity, which 'merited eternal death and certain damnation'[228] This attitude accounts for the extended appeals to divine aid that detail miraculous or supernatural elements, which serve to set First Crusade battle rhetoric apart from contemporary non-crusading orations. This was not entirely without precedent, conforming with certain ecclesiastical precepts of just war. For example, the letter *Gravi de pugna*, long attributed to Augustine, would influence a number of Churchmen regarding the role of the divine in warfare. While Augustine himself argued that Providence governed the outcome of wars, the *Gravi de pugni* was much more forceful in its assurances of divine aid in battle to Christians. It would not be until the twelfth century and the systematization of such ideas by Gratian that the influence of *Gravi de pugna* would wane.[229] That the First Crusade was the work of active rather than passive Providence was directly reinforced by the multitudes of miraculous elements, which served to mark it out as part of sacred, rather than natural history.[230] This construction was often presented directly through battle rhetoric and, as this chapter has argued, divine aid is far from the only prominent appeal oration authors employed when seeking to present the religious, and specifically devotional and penitential nature of the holy war they chronicled.

Suffering and Martyrdom

Two prominent ideas found in First Crusade battle rhetoric, which strongly reflect its devotional nature and serve to distinguish such orations from many non-crusading contemporary speeches, are the endurance of suffering and death for the cause. As the previous chapter discussed, the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* nowhere included motivational appeals concerning

227 FC, p. 246.
228 GN, pp. 112–13.
229 Russell, *Just War*, pp. 26–7, n. 9.
230 John, 'Historical Truth and the Miraculous Past', p. 285.

redemptive suffering, eternal reward in heaven or martyrdom, despite the fact that the text is far from unconcerned with such ideas. The authors who sought to re-write the story of the *Gesta* expanded and refined many of its theological principles in their own work, developing the notions of martyrdom, punishment, penance and suffering,[231] illustrating and illuminating them narratively through direct speech at climactic moments.

Among the scriptural passage which the *Gesta* presents as being significant to Urban's preaching of the crusade is Acts 9:16: 'you must suffer many things for my name'. This closely follows Urban's call for the faithful to take up Christ's cross.[232] The *Gesta* provides many details of this suffering, presenting the hardships as having been endured for the cause of liberating the Holy Sepulchre.[233] Later First Crusade narratives likewise emphasize the anguish of the crusaders. Guibert of Nogent makes explicit the relationship between suffering and sin, comparing the crusaders to the biblical King David, writing; 'but soon entering into the course of sin, he repaid them with difficulties that they swiftly deserved, either of hunger or of other sorts of anguish'.[234] In his recounting of the fighting around Antioch, Guibert also comments on the deprivations suffered by the crusaders and directly contrasts the tremendous suffering endured by the crusaders with other military campaigns:

> These people, to carry away the divine Church from injury, tolerated the miseries of food, rest, watches, cold, rain and the anguish of unfailing fear, which was by no means suffered by any races that we may read or hear about anywhere in the world, and what should be recognised as a greater miracle, when hitherto within their homeland's limits, they could scarcely remain in their king's army for the space of three days in tents, even when not going out beyond their province.[235]

Like Guibert, Robert's *Historia* recounts the hardships endured by the crusaders, explaining them as the penance required for their sins.[236] Suffering is also an important element in two of Robert's battle orations, both delivered while the crusaders are under siege in Antioch. In the first example Bohemond tells his men:

> God has upheld you through the many dangers of various battles and given you victory. You have an impressive track record. So why are you

231 Riley-Smith, *First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, pp. 135–52. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, pp. 48–55.
232 GF, p. 2.
233 GF, p. 63.
234 GN, p. 306.
235 GN, p. 227.
236 RM, p. 67. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk,* p. 56.

> now muttering against God simply because you are suffering from the pangs of famine? When he stretches out his hand to you, you exult; now he withdraws it, you despair. It seems as if you love not the giver but the gifts; not the one who is generous but the results of their generosity. When he is generous God is treated as your friend; when he ceased to give, you seem to consider him unworthy and irrelevant.[237]

The second instance occurs during Adhemar's sermon. The papal legate tells the crusaders to remember their recent sufferings and be reassured by them, because it is through suffering that they have been fully reconciled with God.[238] In this way Robert further develops the idea of suffering and its significance to the crusaders. His message is that the crusaders should not be deterred by their suffering, that it is the wage of their sin incurred on the expedition. As the oration delivered by Bohemond makes clear, the crusaders must remain steadfast in their faith despite their deprivations and suffering because it is through such hardship that they will be cleansed and reconciled with God. This state of righteousness in turn will ensure his aid, and either grant them victory or eternal reward in heaven. Although the conclusions of this development are delivered by a cleric, the oration delivered by Bohemond is an important part of the theological expansion of the idea of suffering, of a complex message that runs throughout Robert's narrative. This goes some way to challenge the idea that commanders were given speeches suited to laymen and orations that conveyed complex theological ideas were reserved for clerics.[239]

The notion that in their suffering the crusaders were cleansed of their sins is not restricted to Robert's *Historia*. Fulcher details the suffering the crusaders faced at the siege of Antioch, and makes clear its redemptive purpose.[240] Moreover, in an instance of battle rhetoric delivered through a vision, a fleeing cleric is told:

> Flee not, but hasten back and tell the others that I shall be with them in this battle. For appeased by the prayers of my Mother, I shall be merciful to the Franks. But because they have sinned they have almost perished. Let their hope in me be constant, and I shall make them triumph over the Turks.[241]

Suffering also features heavily in Albert of Aachen's *Historia*. Albert, like others, details the suffering the crusaders face outside of Antioch for

237 RM, p. 39. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 126.
238 RM, p. 74.
239 Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility', pp. 17–18.
240 FC, p. 224–7.
241 FC, p. 246. Fink, *Fulcher of Chartres*, p. 102.

their sins.[242] In the long battle oration delivered by a Lombard cleric, the crusaders are told that, although they have been oppressed by famine and pestilence and expect to meet death at the hands of the Turks, they should not believe they are undergoing the hardship for nothing and that they should think of 'the reward which Lord Jesus will give back to all of those who will die for his love and favour on this journey'.[243]

While suffering does not appear in the battle rhetoric of Peter Tudebode, Hill and Hill have argued for an association between the idea of penitential suffering and the term *athleta Christi*.[244] This is significant due to the number of battle speeches which employ this phrase including orations in the *Gesta Francorum,*[245] Orderic Vitalis[246] (despite its absence in Baldric's version of the same speech) as well as Peter Tudebode.[247] Like the term *miles Christi*, *athleta Christi* had its roots in monasticism, where it denoted a Christian ideal of suffering. Such monastic athletes pursued God through their agonies, and their trials were celebrated in the liturgy.[248]

It could be argued that the understanding of the crusaders as martyrs represented the pinnacle of the penitential theology of the First Crusade, being the ultimate expression of the endurance of hardship and suffering for spiritual benefit. Moreover, the belief, ecclesiastical or not, that death through warfare merited the martyr's crown displays forcefully the transition which had taken place regarding the figure of a martyr, who in the era of the early Church was regularly the victim, not perpetrator, of military violence.[249] The importance of martyrdom as an appeal in First Crusade battle rhetoric is demonstrated by the number of instances in which it appears, the considerable extent to which the appeal is often developed, as well as the form these appeals often take. As this chapter has already demonstrated, martyrdom or heavenly reward is regularly coupled with 'earthly rewards' with clear primacy going to the former.

Martyrdom and eternal reward are both deployed repeatedly in the battle rhetoric of Robert the Monk. Bohemond's pre-battle speech at Dorylaeum concludes with the call for soldiers to keep their courage because: 'Whether

242 AA, pp. 228–9.
243 AA, pp. 306–7.
244 Hill and Hill, *Peter Tudebode*, p. 17.
245 GF, p. 37.
246 OV, v, p. 79.
247 PT, p. 72.
248 *Athleta Christi nobiles* – 18 May, Matins. Matthew Britt, *The Hymns of the Breviary and Missal* (New York, NY, 1936), p. 252. For the notion of *athleta Christi* in the work of Aelred of Rievaulx, see Aelred Squire, *Aelred of Rievaulx: A Study* (Kalamazoo, MI, 1981), pp. 32–6.
249 Smith, *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture,* p. 76.

you live in him or die for him, you will be blessed'.[250] Adhemar, in his pre-battle sermon, tells the crusaders that 'the man who dies here will be happier than he who lives because he will receive eternal joy in place of his mortal life', following contrasting appeals to heavenly and earthly riches.[251] Robert even pushes this theme in a pre-battle speech by the Emir Clemens, albeit one with almost no hortatory content, in which Clemens tells his soldiers that the crusaders must either be mad, or 'they love death as much as life',[252] because of their willingness to face him in battle at Ascalon. In Baldric of Bourgueil, Bohemond tells the crusaders before battle at Antioch that they will be able to fight bravely, and not perish in a cowardly fashion, because they are assured of their salvation.[253] Guibert also makes frequent references to martyrdom throughout his narrative. He relates a story of captured Christians refusing to convert and being made martyrs for their faith. The Christocentric-mimesis of these moments is emphasized by Guibert's relating of instances of martyrdom, chronologically, to the hours of events in Christ's Passion and Crucifixion.[254] Moreover, Guibert of Nogent, in an earlier oration, draws a direct link between martyrdom and the crusaders' penitential rejection of the world:

> If you have, as you say, devoted to God the military service you practise, if you have scorned your countries, your homes, your wives, your freedoms, if finally you have scorned your bodies and if those same bodies furthermore only remain to be exposed to the glories of martyrdom, how is it, I pray, that this sight can strike any with terror?[255]

Describing that same encounter Guibert writes: 'I do not say as brave as lions', a common description of warriors found frequently in the *chansons de geste*, as well as the *Gesta Tancredi*,[256] 'but more fittingly, as brave as martyrs, carrying banners into the enemy crowd'.[257] Earlier, when describing the siege at Nicaea, Guibert wrote that every knight desired martyrdom, and that those who perished, whether in combat or through starvation, were martyrs.[258]

In the account of Fulcher of Chartres, the appeal of eternal reward appears in an oration following the capture of Jerusalem, delivered by Baldwin I.

250 RM, p. 39. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk,* p. 126.
251 RM, p. 74. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 169.
252 RM, p. 104. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 207.
253 BB, p. 45.
254 GN, pp. 198–9.
255 GN, p. 156.
256 GT, p. 62.
257 GN, p. 157.
258 GN, pp. 148, 152–3.

The king tells his soldiers to 'fight, I beseech you, for the salvation of your soul'.[259] Likewise, Ralph of Caen employs martyrdom as a motivational appeal in instances of battle rhetoric both before and after the capture of Jerusalem. In the speech by Robert of Normandy, Ralph provides an ascending list of appeals, from least to most important, in order to convince the fleeing crusaders to rally, concluding the harangue with:

> We should make our stand here for we will have either the glorious punishment of the defeated or the victor's crown. I say that both of these chances are glorious, but the first is even more blessed than the latter because it will make us blessed that much more quickly. Therefore, go forward my young men, let us die and charge them under arms.[260]

Moreover, the final speech of the *Gesta Tancredi* begins with Tancred addressing his soldiers as '*Christi martyres*' who should be ready to pour out their blood for God.[261]

Albert of Aachen also makes repeated use of the idea of martyrdom in his battle rhetoric. At Dorylaeum, Albert gives an oration to a bishop which claims: 'O race which has been dedicated to God, you left everything for the love of God- riches, fields, vineyards, and castles- and now everlasting life is at hand for you: whoever dies in this conflict is to be crowned a martyr'.[262] This appeal, as well as Guibert's oration that recognizes that the Franks have given up their countries, homes, wives, children,[263] explicitly relates martyrdom with penitential self-denial and *contemptus mundi*. At the very beginning of the *Gesta*, which depicts Urban's preaching, this is demonstrated by the reference to Matthew 16:24.[264] In Robert's *Historia*, Urban's preaching is concluded similarly in a quote of Matthew 10:38: 'he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me'.[265] Likewise, in Albert of Aachen, these ideas appear again alongside the motivational appeal of martyrdom and eternal reward in heaven.[266]

The promises of martyrdom and eternal reward appear in several other instances as motivational appeals in Albert of Aachen's work. In a long speech which also contains the story of a miracle performed by St. Ambrose, the crusaders are told to think of the rewards they will be given

259 FC, p. 412. Fink, *Fulcher of Chartres,* p. 157.
260 GT, p. 26. Bachrach and Bachrach, *Gesta Tancredi*, p. 46.
261 GT, p. 131.
262 AA, pp. 106–77.
263 GN, p. 156.
264 GF, p. 1.
265 RM, pp. 7–8.
266 AA, pp. 276–7.

for dying for Christ.[267] Moreover, in an oration before the final battle at Antioch against Kerbogha, Adhemar, Godfrey and Robert of Flanders conclude their speech by saying 'let us stand firm and die in the Lord's name as is the purpose of our journey'.[268] Before the Battle of Ascalon, Godfrey is given another battle oration which includes an extended appeal to martyrdom:

> Know that these people, whom you see and hear singing in exaltations as they hurry towards their enemies and join battle in the name of Lord Jesus Christ their God, are certain today of the crown of the kingdom of heaven, and know that they will pass into a better life, in which they shall begin to live more happily for the first time, if they are found worthy to die in this battle for his name and favour. For this reason our hearts are lifted to joy and jubilation, that if we should chance to fall into the hands of the enemy, Lord Jesus our God has the power to place our souls in the paradise of His glory, and because of this we do not fear death or the charge of the enemy, since we are sure of His eternal reward after death in this world.[269]

Additionally, it is worth noting that the motivational appeal of eternal reward in heaven also remains a prominent part of Albert of Aachen's battle rhetoric beyond 1099.[270]

All of the narratives of the First Crusade that this chapter is concerned with present the notion that those who died on the First Crusade, whether fighting or through deprivation, should be considered martyrs. However, some narratives also represent this idea as being at the forefront of soldiers' minds immediately before or sometimes during battle, through motivational appeals in battle rhetoric. This could be understood to represent a step in western European writing in the early twelfth century towards a more fully realized notion of the First Crusade as a holy war where fighting was spiritually meritorious and was both related to and yet in some fashion distinct from penitential pilgrimage.

In the first half of the twelfth century, the notion of fighting for spiritual reward, even unto death, resonated powerfully in the minds of elites, both ecclesiastics and laymen, across Europe. The campaigns against Muslim powers in the Mediterranean and particularly in the Iberian peninsula provided the impetus for the development and projection of crusading ideals onto a number of conflicts.[271] Not all of these conflicts were contemporary, however, and crusading spirituality was, intentionally or not, cast backward

267 AA, pp. 308–9.
268 AA, pp. 314–5.
269 AA pp. 460–1.
270 AA, pp. 582–3.
271 Paul, 'Crusade and Family Memory', pp. 123–217.

onto a number of ancient wars which were part of a pre-existing tradition of a perceived struggle against Islam.[272] Likewise, the same can be seen in accounts of ancient conflicts against European pagans. For example, a number of the battle orations found in Geoffrey of Monmouth's *De gestis Britonum* bear the influence of ideas found in First Crusade narratives. In a speech delivered by Archbishop Dubricius to King Arthur's army before battle against the Saxons *c*. 516 the Britons are exhorted with the words:

> Men, distinguished as you are by your Christian faith, do not forget your love for your land and fellow-countrymen, whose expulsion by the treacherous pagans will be a reproach against you forever if you fail to protect them. Fight for your country, ready to die for it if you must. Such a death means victory and the salvation of your souls. Whoever lays down his life for his fellow-Christians, dedicates himself as a living sacrifice to God and patently follows Christ, who deigned to die for his brothers. If any of you falls in this battle, let his death, provided he does not shrink from it, be the repentance and cleansing of all his sins.[273]

Here then familiar non-crusade specific appeals to the defence of the *patria* and its people, a widely recognized *iusta causa*,[274] are presented as Christ-like self-sacrifice meriting spiritual benefit. Moreover, that these notions were carefully selected and deployed is evidenced by the divergence in central themes found across Geoffrey's uncommonly extensive corpus of battle orations.[275]

The influence of First Crusade narratives on non-crusading battle rhetoric is not only discernible through common appeals, but also from instances of direct textual borrowing. The *Chronica de gestis consulum Andegauorum*, in detailing the deeds of Geoffrey Greymantle, Count of Anjou (960–87) includes an invented speech for a likewise invented battle, supposedly fought by the count alongside Hugh Capet, against the Normans (referred to as Northmen, or Danes) near Soissons. This speech, delivered by the French king, as well several others which take place during the account of Geoffrey's primacy, are clear borrowings from the *Historia* of Baldric of Bougueil.[276] Of these textual borrowings, many have been examined by Neil Wright, although the reliance on Baldric for battle rhetoric to draw upon in

272 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, pp. 120–78.

273 Reeve, *Geoffrey of Monmouth*, pp. 198–9.

274 Russell, *Just War*, p. 38.

275 Reeve, *Geoffrey of Monmouth*, pp. 22–3, 24–5, 166–7, 172–3, 196–7, 198–9, 236–7, 238–9, 244–5.

276 Marchegay and Salmon, *Chroniques*, i, pp. 82–3, 84. Cf. BB, p. 44–6.

the *Chronica* is even greater than previously identified.[277] In addition to the three orations Wright analyzed, the *Chronica* also includes a second short speech by Geoffrey Greymantle, who is given the words of one of Bohemond's Antioch speeches.[278] This speech, like the others, no doubt in part appealed to the author of the *Chronica* because of the emphasis on Frankish ancestry and achievement prominent in Baldric's battle rhetoric, which has been discussed earlier. Beyond this, the borrowings serve to cast the ideals of holy war backwards from the twelfth century to Frankish struggles against pagan Northmen almost two centuries prior to the *Chronica*'s inception. While Wright has discussed the possibility that these borrowings would have been recognized by contemporary readers, his suggestion that through this intertextuality the battle at Soissions was made into a link of the continual history of salvation is supported by a close reading of a later oration in the *Chronica* delivered by Fulk V, later king of Jerusalem. In an eagerness to sanctify the counts of Anjou, this oration goes so far as to frame Fulk's conflicts against other northern-French lords as a holy war, including an extended appeal to divine aid, as well as incorporating an extended scriptural reference to 1 Maccabees 3:18–22, an exhortation by Judas Maccabeus.[279]

The Cross and the Holy Sepulchre

The previous chapter argued that the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta Francorum* was centrally concerned with expressing the penitential devotion at the heart of the crusading venture. This spirituality was essential to the wider explanatory framework within which authors constructed and represented the First Crusade, which crucially relied upon the righteousness and good intentions of those signed with the cross. The adoption and continual manifestation of the complex symbol of the Holy Cross, a powerful theme in contemporary devotional writing,[280] signals its significance to First Crusade narratives and provides insight into its multiple meanings.

In the Tudebode version of Bohemond's speech to Robert FitzGerard, the idea of the cross is used in a talismanic sense, with Bohemond telling Robert to 'go forth, armed on all sides with the sign of the cross'.[281] While not mentioned explicitly in the orations themselves, references to the talismanic quality of the Holy Cross are found in the versions of this speech

277 Neil Wright, 'Epic and Romance in the Chronicles of Anjou', in *Anglo-Norman Studies 26: The Proceedings of Battle Conference 2003*, ed. John Gillingham (Woodbridge 2004), pp. 177–90.

278 Marchegay and Salmon, *Chroniques*, i, p. 83. BB, pp. 46.

279 Marchegay and Salmon, *Chroniques*, i, pp. 146–7.

280 Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea*, p. 24.

281 PT, p. 72. Hill and Hill, *Peter Tudebode*, p. 51.

in both Baldric of Bourgueil[282] and Orderic Vitalis.[283] This attribute of the Holy Cross is also put across in Robert's *Historia* where Robert records that soldiers made the sign of the cross before going into battle.[284] This attribute of the cross as protective, or otherwise supportive of the crusaders in battle, is also extended to the relic of the True Cross. Towards the end of Guibert's account, the crusaders blame misfortune on the battlefield on the absence of the relic.[285] In Fulcher's work, the True Cross is described during a battle as throwing the enemy into confusion and disarray by its very presence.[286] Similarly, in the *Gesta Tancredi*, the enemy lose their sight at the sign of the cross.[287]

This is not the only form the cross takes which holds particularly bellicose connotations. Early in his account, Tudebode closely follows the *Gesta* in his oration at Dorylaeum in which the crusaders are told to be encouraged by the victory of the 'banner of the sacred Cross'.[288] However, it is Tudebode, followed by the *Historia Belli Sacri*, not the *Gesta*, which explicitly conceptualizes the cross as a banner (*sanctæ Crucis vexilli*).[289] This form of the cross appeal seems to integrate the notions of the symbol as an emblem of victory, which had a long and imperial history,[290] with a more direct understanding of divine aid. In Malaterra's *De rebus gestis*, before the Battle of Cerami in 1063, where the Normans are said to have been 'marked by the title of Christ', Geoffrey describes a vision wherein a banner displaying the cross appeared on Count Roger's spear.[291]

While absent from Baldric's version of the speech to Robert FitzGerard, the cross is employed as part of his final and most theologically detailed oration. In this instance the cross is used specifically in reference to Christ's crucifixion, humanity and recent torment at the hands of the enemy. Herein the crusaders are told: 'strive eagerly for Christ, who until today has been outlawed and crucified in this city, and together with Joseph take him down from the cross, and in the sepulchre of your heart put the incomparable treasure, that longed for treasure, and boldly snatch him from those unholy crucifiers'.[292] In this way, Baldric uses the cross to reinforce a prominent theme of his narrative, the *familia Christi*. Shortly after the aforementioned

282 BB, pp. 46–7.
283 OV, v, pp. 78–9.
284 RM, p. 42.
285 GN, pp. 345–6.
286 FC, p. 414.
287 GT, p. 76.
288 PT, p. 53.
289 HBS, p. 31. Cf. GF, pp. 18–20.
290 Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200–1000* (Oxford, 2003), p. 302, 391. John Moorhead, 'Iconoclasm, the Cross and the Imperial Image', *Byzantium*, 55 (1985), pp. 165–79.
291 GM, pp. 43–4.
292 BB, p. 108.

appeal, the same oration claims that as long as the enemy attack the *fratres* of the crusaders, they continue to crucify Christ.[293]

The battle rhetoric of Guibert of Nogent only references the cross once, in an instance where a group of the crusade leaders tell their soldiers to 'surrender, therefore, your minds and bodies to the faith of the Lord of the Cross'.[294] This instance appears to be more concerned with presenting the cross as a focal point of reverence, rather than as a device to motivate soldiers to fight. Just as the death, or rather the martyrdom, of certain crusaders is given chronological significance, so too Guibert presents the capture of Jerusalem as taking place upon the hour in which Christ was put on the cross.[295] During the siege of Jerusalem, Guibert records men commenting that they fear they are unworthy to worship Christ's Cross or his tomb. Here then the cross is target of reverence comparable to the Holy Sepulchre.[296]

That battle rhetoric would utilize the idea of the cross largely in its protective or victorious manifestations seems obvious given the nature of such speeches. However, as the previous chapter demonstrated, the cross was also presented by the *Gesta* as central to Urban's preaching and reflected the venture's devotional and penitential spirituality. These ideas are also prominent in later narratives of the First Crusade. In a direct appeal for Westerners to travel to the Holy Land following the capture of Jerusalem, Fulcher asks 'why should one return to the Occident who has found the Orient like this? God does not wish those to suffer want who with their crosses dedicated themselves to follow Him, nay even to the end'.[297] This echoing of Matthew 16:24 serves to highlight the devotion of the crusaders, as well as extend the crusading endeavour beyond the capture of Jerusalem. While Fulcher did not employ the cross in his battle rhetoric there are examples of the cross being deployed by oration authors in forms that go beyond protection and victory, in order to speak directly about salvation. In an oration of Albert of Aachen, Godfrey of Bouillon claims:

> Indeed, this sign of the Holy Cross by which we are protected and sanctified is beyond doubt a spiritual shield against all the enemies' missiles, and putting our hope in that same sign we venture to stand more firmly against all dangers. And assuredly we have been redeemed by this wood of the Holy Cross from the hand of death and hell, and by angelic power from harm, and we have been cleansed in the blood of

293 BB, p. 108.
294 GN, p. 156.
295 GN, p. 282.
296 GN, p. 277.
297 FC, p. 749. Fink, *Fulcher of Chartres,* p. 272.

> Lord Jesus, son of the living God, from all the filth of former error, and we have confidence in eternal life.[298]

This oration displays, perhaps better than any other, how the cross provided oration authors with a potent multifaceted symbol which through faith brought protection and victory, but which also was shorthand for more complex ideas about penance, repentance and salvation. Examples of such appeals beyond 1099 illustrate how, for many authors, the essence of the First Crusade lived on after the capture of Jerusalem. In a speech by Baldwin I, recorded by Albert of Aachen, in which the crusaders are presented as being in a particularly desperate situation, the king states: 'I don't know what else I may advise, other than that we all stand firm in the name of Lord Jesus and the power of the Holy Cross, and fight against the unbelievers'.[299]

The development and deployment of the cross in First Crusade battle rhetoric should also be placed within the context of its revolutionary adoption as a personal emblem by the early crusaders. The cross was for many authors at the heart of their attempts to espouse a coherent theology of crusading, as well as to address the typological conundrum the expedition posed in its combination of pilgrimage and military activity.[300] As in the *Gesta*, among other accounts, Guibert of Nogent identifies the badge of the cross, along with the war-cry '*Deus id vult*', as being crucial in merging both the disparate participants of the crusade as well as the disparate practices of pilgrimage and soldiery.[301] Robert the Monk allied these two aspects by referring to the crusaders as the 'pilgrim knights' of Christ.[302] Robert's work more broadly has been described as being produced in the context of genuine caution regarding the unification of these ideas.[303] This would have only heightened the pressure to present the crusaders in a positive light, a task to which the emblem of the cross seemingly became a significant aid. The validity of the use of the cross in these instances would have hinged on a successful defence of crusading against critics, which would have been impossible without championing the spiritual righteousness and good intentions of the crusaders.[304] In this way, the cross was brought directly into the broader explanatory framework of the First Crusade which has already been discussed. That the deployment of the cross, and the understanding of being

298 AA, pp. 460–1.
299 AA, p. 582–3.
300 Léan Ní Chléirigh, 'Nova Peregrinatio: The First Crusade as a Pilgrimage in Contemporary Latin Narratives', in Bull and Kempf, *Writing the Early Crusades,* pp. 63–74.
301 Kane, *Impact*, p. 85–6,
302 peregrini milites … RM, p. 18, 83, 106.
303 Chléirigh, 'Nova Peregrinatio', p. 73.
304 Lehtonen and Jensen, *Medieval History Writing*, p. 20.

crucesignatus, could add moral legitimacy to military activity whether it be against Muslim opponents or not, is illustrated by Orderic Vitalis's description of the resistance of Helias, Count of Maine, to William Rufus, where Helias swears to fight at home in fulfilment of his crusading vow with the cross as his emblem as a knight of Christ.[305]

The adaptability and multifaceted nature of the cross accounts for its popularity as a device to be utilized by oration authors. Not only did the adoption of the cross encompass the novelty of the First Crusade, its history as a sign of victory and mark of protection was well established by the eleventh century. Moreover, the 'portable symbol' of the cross could be used to reflect Jerusalem not just beyond 1099, but as the twelfth century went on could be redeployed in wars outside of the Holy Land. This was not the case for the Holy Sepulchre, despite its position as a prominent sacred symbol of First Crusade narratives. The centrality of the Holy Sepulchre to the expedition of the First Crusade is evident throughout early twelfth-century narratives. In Robert the Monk's account of the Council of Clermont, the assembled are implored to be moved to action by the Sepulchre.[306] The Holy Sepulchre is also invoked when Bishop Adhemar of Le Puy is given charge over the pilgrims,[307] and again when Raymond of Toulouse, is introduced to the narrative.[308] The nature of the crusade as a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre is referred to on a number of occasions through Robert's *Historia*, including in the lament of Walo's wife,[309] and in the oaths the crusade leaders take not to turn aside from the endeavour to reach Jerusalem.[310] Despite this, the Holy Sepulchre is absent from Robert's battle rhetoric. Neither does it appear in Baldric's account at the Battle of the Lake, where the *Gesta* employs it, and Orderic likewise omits it from his rendition of this speech. Guibert, who writes at great length of the Holy Sepulchre in his narrative, also does not employ it as an appeal in his battle orations. Moreover, Peter Tudebode, despite claiming the crusaders' battle cry at Civetot referenced the Holy Sepulchre,[311] nowhere in his battle rhetoric utilizes this appeal. Neither Ralph of Caen or Albert of Aachen in any of his twelve books employs the Holy Sepulchre in battle rhetoric. It is, however, preserved in a version of Bohemond's speech to Robert FitzGerard in the *Historia Belli Sacri*, where Bohemond reminds Robert to be 'confident in the help of God and the Holy Sepulchre'.[312]

305 OV, v, pp. 230–1. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality,* p. 144.
306 RM, p. 6.
307 RM, p. 8.
308 RM, p. 13.
309 RM, pp. 50–1.
310 RM, p. 83.
311 PT, p. 35.
312 HBS, p. 191.

It is difficult to explain why the Holy Sepulchre, despite appearing in the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta*, is largely absent from the orations of subsequent accounts of the First Crusade. As the previous chapter argued, the devotion to the Holy Sepulchre in the *Gesta* reflected the view of Jerusalem which was prevalent in western Europe until 1099, namely that Jerusalem was the city of the Holy Sepulchre. However, Sylvia Schein has argued that following the capture of the city in 1099 the understanding of Jerusalem as the city of the Holy Sepulchre underwent a rapid and significant transformation, with Jerusalem instead becoming the city of Christ's life and passion.[313] While this perhaps accounts in part for the dearth of reference to the Holy Sepulchre in later battle rhetoric, the narratives which this chapter is concerned with are far from uninterested in the Sepulchre. In reference to the construction of battle rhetoric, as has been argued earlier, the complex ideas of salvation, penance and redemption authors wished to convey could be presented just as forcefully by the Holy Cross as the Holy Sepulchre. The cross also carried with it connotations of victory and protection that were evidently thought to be more appropriate to present as being at the forefront of soldiers' minds prior to battle.

Unity

As was argued in Chapter Two, a prominent theme of the *Gesta Francorum* was the notion of Christian unity. In the second speech at Dorylaeum, the crusaders are called upon to stand '*unanimes in fide Christi*'.[314] Similarly, in the speech before the attack on Antioch, Bohemond tells his men to go '*securo animo et felici concordia*'.[315] The importance of terms such as *unanimis* and *concors*, which reflect the importance of ideas of the *vita apostolica* and *ecclesia primitiva* to crusading spirituality in the early twelfth century, has also previously been established. Unity is likewise an important theme in a number of later First Crusade narratives, including works which did not rely on the *Gesta*. Robert the Monk, detailing the departure of the crusaders, describes them as marching to war *unanimiter*.[316] In Adhemar's speech at Antioch, the bishop tells the crusaders to 'fight together in common purpose (*unanimes*), like brothers'.[317] Peter Tudebode closely follows the second oration of the *Gesta*, his account of Dorylaeum featuring an oration that begins with a call for the crusaders to be '*unanimes in fide Christi*'.[318] Baldric of Bourgueil employs the same language in a speech

313 Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City*, p. 20, 63.
314 GF, p. 20.
315 GF, p. 46.
316 RM, p. 13.
317 RM, p. 74.
318 PT, p. 53.

given to Bohemond at Antioch, beginning the oration saying 'I see you, thanks be to God, are all of one mind'.[319]

Biddlecombe has argued that Baldric's understanding of the *familia Christi* crucially encompassed Eastern Christians who resided in the new-born Latin states of the East.[320] Christopher MacEvitt has stated in regard to Latin relations with Eastern Christians that this Christian unity was not a literary construct invented by Westerners such as Baldric, but that the theme of unity reflected a continual working reality in the Latin East during and after the First Crusade.[321] It seems similarly the case that the emphasis on unity found in battle rhetoric reflected the dangerous reality of those who took part in the expedition. That crusading ideology and spirituality was shaped by the events of the First Crusade has been forcefully argued by Riley-Smith,[322] and the forms taken by appeals to unity highlight how violent reality was blended with serious spirituality and sincere motivation. While the motive appeal of defence does not often appear in crusading battle rhetoric, it is employed by Baldric in two separate orations. Bohemond's oration at Dorylaeum includes a demand that the crusaders defend themselves and their country,[323] and in his oration at Antioch the crusaders are told to 'support each other, and each of you should fight for all of you and defend each other'.[324] In these examples, collective defence serves to reinforce Baldric's notion of the crusaders as a united *familia Christi*. Familial language was also heavily employed by Baldric, who in his final oration wrote: 'Listen, brothers and lords'.[325] Likewise, the crusaders are told to 'rouse yourselves, family of Christ',[326] and that 'as long as those evil judges, the accomplices of Herod and Pilate, insult and afflict your brothers, they also crucify Christ'.[327] Moreover, it is in this oration that the speakers tell those about to assault the walls of Jerusalem:

> I speak to you as fathers, sons, brothers and grandchildren. If some foreigner strikes one of your people will you not avenge your blood? All the more you must avenge your God, who is your father, your brother, whom you see insulted, outlawed and crucified, whom you hear calling in desolation and demanding help.[328]

319 BB, p. 45.
320 Biddlecombe, 'Baldric of Bourgueil and the *Familia Christi*', p. 23.
321 Christopher H. MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East: Rough Tolerance* (Philedelphia, PA, 2008), pp. 22–5.
322 Riley-Smith, *First Crusade and the Idea*, pp. 58–120.
323 BB, p. 31.
324 BB, p. 45.
325 BB, p. 107.
326 BB, p. 107.
327 BB, p. 107.
328 BB, p. 109.

A number of other First Crusade narratives also make use of familial language in their battle rhetoric, which typically serves to stress social and religious cohesion. Adhemar's speech in Robert the Monk begins with a reference to Romans 6:3, with the crusaders being told: 'all of us who were baptized into Jesus Christ are both sons of God and brothers together: we are bound by one and the same spiritual link and by the same love'.[329] Moreover, when being exhorted to fight together in common purpose, they are told to do so like brothers.[330] Albert of Aachen likewise employs familial language in three of his battle orations.[331] In two of these instances, the use of the word *fratres* is involved in an appeal for the fighting men not to abandon their fellows. In a speech given by Duke Godfrey and Robert of Flanders the crusaders are told: 'Stand firm and endure with manly spirit all your difficulties for Christ's name, and do not desert your brothers at all in this time of trouble, and incur God's wrath, whose favour and mercy do not lack for those who trust in him'.[332] A later oration delivered by Godfrey, Robert and Adhemar contains a demand that the crusaders be 'steadfast in Christ's love, and never practise this deceit on your brothers, stealing away from them and fleeing'.[333] It could be argued that the same idea of unity is put across by Albert in his oration which quotes John 15:13, prescribing that 'it is the charity of God to lay down one's life for one's friend'.[334] The link between charity as an expression of Christian love and those identified as family seems to be even clearer in Baldric's work, whose second battle oration exhorts the crusaders to 'lay down your lives for your brothers'.[335]

It is evident then that unity is a significant theme of First Crusade battle rhetoric in narratives that followed the *Gesta Francorum*. It is likely that its frequency is being reflective of the twofold development of the crusading endeavour, both as it was experienced by participants and as it was understood, reconstructed and represented by narrative authors. In calls for Christian unity, authors could espouse the ideology of crusading in a rousing fashion that would engage with their audiences through direct speech at the climactic moments in their stories. That the crusaders fought *unanimiter*, defending their *frates* even unto death, was a forceful display of Christian love and charity and was a crucial part of the presentation of crusading as an act of Christo-mimesis, which served to involve participants in the lives and works of the apostles and the *ecclesia primitiva*.[336] Like the *vita apostolica*, the crusading movement was, for many commentators,

329 RM, p. 74.
330 RM, p. 74.
331 AA, p. 307, 311, 315.
332 AA, p. 311.
333 AA, pp. 312–15.
334 AA, pp. 276–7.
335 BB, p. 45.
336 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, p. 47.

defined by its single-mindedness and, through their depictions of the direct words spoken by princes to crusaders, oration authors revealed the components and priorities of this unifying mindset. Central to this mentality was penitential devotion, a piety which looked to God for physical as well as spiritual salvation, that was nevertheless active not passive, being expressed in the courageous deeds of a chosen people. Moreover, this devotion demanded spiritual righteousness, which was reflected in good intention and proper behaviour. These were crucial for maintaining both the discipline and cohesion of the crusading army as well as the favour of heaven. Sin was of great concern, whether it was lust for women, bellicose pride that celebrated the strength of arms and men over God, or greed which encouraged men to risk their fellows as well as their souls seeking after plunder. Disputes over spoils in particular contravened the apostolic image of a community who sold all they had to provide for everyone according to their need.[337]

Vengeance and Justice

The moral and didactic nature of these texts is signalled clearly through their battle orations, as well as throughout the broader narratives. In one of Albert of Aachen's longest orations, the crusaders are told the story of a pilgrim, later revealed to be St. Ambrose of Milan, who assures them that, despite rumours to the contrary, the crusade has been undertaken at the instruction of God, not for frivolous reasons. However, the saint makes clear that in order to be counted amongst the martyrs upon their death, it is imperative that the crusaders abstain from sin, specifying avarice, theft, adultery and fornication.[338] Baldric of Bourgueil explicitly linked the discipline of the crusading army with their moral conduct and intentions in the final book of his *Historia*:

> For they allowed nothing unplanned or disorderly. The undisciplined were punished, the ignorant were educated, the unruly were rebuked. The intemperate were reproved for their intemperance, and all generally were urged to give alms. They all made honesty and chastity their concern as well. And, so to speak, there was a school of moral education in the camp. Such was the manner and such was the appearance of those going on foot to Jerusalem. As long as they kept the rigour of this discipline and abounded in charitable feeling, God manifestly dwelt among them and He fought their battles through them. On this subject we shall say this, that we rebuke those who praise the life and way of those undisciplined men who followed this

337 Acts 2:44–5.
338 AA, pp. 308–9.

campaign in vainglorious arrogance. For there is nothing more useful among men than discipline.[339]

Displaying good moral conduct and righteous intention was thus a priority for the authors of many Latin narratives of the First Crusade, and this was reflected in their battle rhetoric. Such an interpretation of battle rhetoric contradicts many of the conclusions of John Bliese, who saw in motivational appeals such as the promise of glory or riches the true motivations of knights. More specifically, Bliese saw in appeals to vengeance a lack of concern for the laws and conventions which were thought to determine whether a particular military undertaking was just or unjust.[340] Even if that were the case, it has been demonstrated that among the earliest crusading narratives the notion of vengeance was rare.[341] Moreover, surveying instances where vengeance is presented as a motivation for crusaders over the course of the twelfth century reveals that far from being brought to crusading by the arms-bearing elite, only to be subsequently eclipsed as crusading developed, references to vengeance actually increased over time.[342]

It is in concordance with this model that the First Crusade narratives which do present vengeance as a motivator in battle rhetoric are not the earliest eyewitness accounts, but the later renderings. As was shown earlier, Baldric of Bourgueil, in his climactic Jerusalem sermon, calls for the crusaders to take vengeance.[343] While there are no other First Crusade orations which discuss vengeance, Orderic Vitalis provides a short speech to Baldwin I of Jerusalem delivered during an attack upon Jaffa where the notion of vengeance for God is central.[344]

These instances highlight the misinterpretation of calls for vengeance in battle rhetoric, which have in vernacular *chansons* been described as reflective of a Germanic, pagan-influenced culture, rather than a Christianized culture.[345] This view of vengeance simply as aristocratic vendetta lusted after by arms-bearers led to an understanding that Bliese acknowledged as contradictory, of vengeance as an improper motivator for just and righteous warfare, yet one which was nevertheless represented and perhaps even promoted by Latin narrative authors. This view rests upon a wide survey and it is beneficial to particularize the problem. Bliese has argued that in

339 BB, p. 101. Unpublished translation by Susan Edgington.

340 Bliese, 'Just War as Concept and Motive', p. 8.

341 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 44–7. For a definition and understanding of vengeance as denoted by *ultio, vindicta*, and related terms see Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 1–41.

342 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 70–1.

343 BB, p. 109. Isiah 63:3.

344 OV, v, p. 348.

345 Bliese, 'Fighting Spirit and Literary Genre', pp. 427–8. George Fenwick Jones, *The Ethos of the Song of Roland* (Baltimore, MD, 1963), p. 82.

crafting their battle orations, authors had little concern for the strictures on the legality and spiritualty of warfare as they were prescribed by theologians and lawyers and has suggested that orations almost never conform to the tenants of Just War theory, as it was formulated by Augustine.[346] However, prior to Gratian's *Decretum*, there was no single comprehensive and coherent collection of writings on the topic of just war available to authors, with writings on the subject being produced by a number of different theorists across a significant period of time.[347] Prominent amongst them was Augustine; however, Cowdrey has highlighted how during the eleventh century Augustine's ideas on the subject of war were not widespread or often referenced. Gregory VII quoted Augustine in only a single instance, and while Anselm of Lucca drew heavily on Augustine, his formulation of righteous warfare relied in particular on Augustine's anti-Donatist writings,[348] and Anselm's formulation of holy war has been understood as marking a particular turning point in this regard.[349] It is Anselm's *Collectio canonum* which drew together the disparate works on violence by Augustine. These were connected largely by the notion of sin, to argue that the punishment was not only a matter of justice but also of love and charity, and that righteous wars could be waged with this benevolent intention.[350]

Thus, the call for vengeance in Baldric's final battle oration, as well as many of the references to vengeance in First Crusade sources, were far from inconsistent with a view of just war which relied upon the righteous intention or a sense of justice on the part of participants. Augustine was clear in the purpose of just wars as avenging injuries, and without the righteous enactment of such vengeance, in the case of grave sin or crimes, there could be no true justice.[351] Sin required punishment, and unearned mercy, either for the crusaders or their enemies, was unacceptable.[352] In the case of the First Crusade, the various accounts of the Council of Clermont depict the crimes which have taken place in the East, often in emotionally charged language drawn from Scripture. The imperative to take vengeance is heightened in Baldric's *Historia* by its formulation as revenge on behalf of God, that was in fact enacted by God through the crusaders. The notion of

346 Bliese, 'Just War as Concept and Motive', pp. 10–14.

347 Russell, *Just War*, p. 38.

348 Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, 'Canon Law and the First Crusade', in *The Horns of Hattin: proceedings of the Second Conference of the Society for the study of the Crusades and the Latin East, Jerusalem and Haifa 2–6 July, 1987* ed. by Benjamin Z. Kedar (Jerusalem and London, 1992), pp. 41–3. Russell, *Just War*, p. 36.

349 Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, p. 241–8.

350 Russell, *Just War*, p. 25. Cowdrey, 'Canon Law and the First Crusade', p. 44. Riley-Smith, 'Crusading as an Act of Love', p. 188. 'S. Anselmus Lucensis Episcopus. Collectio canonica. Liber XIII' in *Victoris III Romani Pontificis, Sancti Anselmi Lucensis, Opera Omnia, PL*, 149, 533–4.

351 Russell, *Just War*, pp. 18–19.

352 Kangas, 'Deus Vult: Violence and Suffering', p. 167.

holy wars as God's vengeance of course pre-dated the First Crusade,[353] but in First Crusade sources it is given a more particular character through the emphasis on the spiritual and social obligation put on the crusaders to defend or avenge their fellows.[354] In this way, orations could in fact present appeals concerned with love and charity which were far from unpragmatic and overly idealized compared to promises of spoils or incitement to kill hated enemies.[355] An examination of battle rhetoric and the proper contextualization of these orations illustrates how First Crusade narratives sought to glorify Christ-like self-sacrifice and martyrdom, not the seizing of wealth or secular vengeance.[356]

Conclusion

It is clear that far from being rhetorical ornamentation, battle orations were believed by oration authors to be an effective means of articulating the ideology and theology of the First Crusade in the aftermath of its success. The triumph of the 1096–1099 campaign and the proliferation of battle orations in the Latin narratives which recounted it are inextricably linked, with no oration presented as taking place between Clermont and the capture of Jerusalem occurring prior to a defeat. Narrative authors sought not only to explain and celebrate the crusade's military successes, but also to account for the broader phenomenon which had brought them about. Centrally, First Crusade battle rhetoric emphasizes the divinely directed nature of the crusade, the good intentions of participants who nevertheless suffer for their sins in order to be made righteous before God, and the importance of discipline and unity among the Christian community. These priorities, while not uniformly ascribed to by all narrative authors, evidently influenced the form and content of battle orations to a high degree.

As with the *Gesta*, while uncomplicated calls for martial virtue are not uncommon, they are never provided with any significant development and more often than not are presented with religious reinforcement. That appeals to glory or calls for bravery are presented as being in reference to the glory of God and Heaven, or the bravery of being sure of a blessed afterlife, both conforms to a perceived need to praise the deeds of God rather than celebrate the actions of men.

As with the desire for earthly glory, the canons of Clermont also warned against the adoption of the cross for reasons of personal gain. This concern over intention is manifest through First Crusade battle rhetoric,

353 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, p. 47. Jean Flori, *Croisade et Chevalerie, XIe–XIIe siècles* (Bruxelles, 1998), p. 198.

354 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 57–64.

355 Bliese, 'Just War as Concept and Motive', p. 10.

356 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance,* p. 48.

which is not only notable for the limited use of an otherwise popular appeal, but also for the manner in which authors utilize such appeals to involve the taking of spoils and the attainment of wealth within the larger moral and didactic framework of their narratives. While almost all oration authors present the wealth acquired by the crusaders as God-given, many develop this notion further, contrasting earthly wealth with the greater riches of heaven. That plunder-seeking could lead to sin, and thus undermine the expedition, results in clear condemnation of such vices, with Albert of Aachen notably shaping an entire oration around such a warning. In this way authors reconciled the well-understood need for a campaigning army to take spoils with the ideals, both secular as well as religious, which recognized the evils of greed. Where greed is most forcefully condemned are those moments when the division it causes threatens the crusading expedition. In spawning sinful avarice, and in many cases being presented as the bait used by foes to lure Christians away from their fellows and to their doom, greed was a twofold threat to unity.

This emphasis on unity in part accounts for the lack of diversity among appeals to the *gentes* or *nationes* of the crusaders. While the multiplicity of peoples undertaking the pilgrimage is evident, it is the Franks alone who take centre-stage. That there is a northern-French bias amongst the narratives of the First Crusade is obvious; however, it is also evident that narrative authors were not uninterested in the other *gentes* that formed the crusading army. While no other peoples are named in the motivational appeals of battle rhetoric, a concern for the collective of Christianity, and the reputation of Christian peoples, does feature. In a fashion similar to certain non-northern French princes being claimed as Franks, non-French crusaders are often identified together in battle rhetoric as Franks, as well as Christians, being conceptualized as a single people defined by their faith.

The use of appeals to martial virtue, to wealth, and to the characteristics and reputations of *gentes* illustrates how such notions were represented and understood in the wider, divinely directed, framework of the crusade. They highlight how oration authors could present wealth as a motivational appeal without contravening sincerely held notions concerning the importance of righteous motivation in war, as well as the consequences of sin. This serves to undermine the idea that there was a sharp divide between 'religious' and 'secular' motivations for the adoption of the cross, and points to the need for a more forceful rejection of dichotomous understandings of medieval Christian religious practices.[357] In this regard, Baldric of Bourgueil's battle rhetoric in particular displays how physical and spiritual bellicosity were intertwined, the former being

357 Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore, MD, 1993), p. 63.

fought in order to proceed with the latter. In this way the development of martial or 'chivalric' virtues was an important part of the active piety which orations often called for.

Divine aid is unsurprisingly a prominent appeal in First Crusade battle rhetoric, and one which varies greatly in its form and content. Centrally, these promises, particularly those that make reference to supernatural or divine forces intervening directly in battle, serve to highlight the place of the First Crusade in the divinely directed chain of sacral history. It is the agency of God, often interpreted through victories or disasters and believed to be contingent upon moral and spiritual righteousness, which serves as a crux between appeals that highlight the penitential and the devotional. These in turn are associated with the adoption of the cross and 'conversion' to the quasi-monastic life of the early crusaders. Appeals to suffering and martyrdom, as well as the invocation of the Holy Cross, all forcefully advance the devotional and penitential nature of the First Crusade. Moreover, that these ideas are purposefully incorporated into orations alongside, although subordinate to, appeals to 'earthly' rewards only serves to erase further the notion of dichotomous motivational appeals and illustrate the paralleled physical and spiritual battles of the crusaders. The symbol of the cross in particular was employed in order to bridge the conceptual gap between the understanding of crusaders on the one hand as warriors and on the other as pilgrims. Its potency and multifaceted utility was the driving force behind the continual deployment of the Holy Cross in battle rhetoric, in contrast to the Holy Sepulchre.

Just as the hardships endured by the crusaders during the expedition shaped subsequent crusading theology, so the dangerous reality of campaigning reinforced the importance of Christian unity. The necessity of communal defence in hostile territory provided oration authors with the perfect opportunity to display the Christo-mimetic nature of crusading, with orators imploring their men to feats of self-sacrifice for the love of Christ and their fellows. This obligation was extended to a broader grouping of the *familia Christi*, who required not only defending but avenging. In this sense First Crusade battle rhetoric was very much in line with Augustinian notions of righteous warfare, which were defined centrally by a concern for the correction of sin. Moreover, the formulation of Augustinian ideas in the eleventh century by writers such as Anselm of Lucca provided a theological basis for authors to present crusading as being an expression, not only of justice, but also of Christian love and charity.

This chapter has also demonstrated how important elements of battle rhetoric were exploited, reformed and redeployed by writers of non-crusade accounts. It is in this way that the battle rhetoric of First Crusade narratives points towards a broader understanding of how sacralised warfare was understood and represented in the early twelfth century, a period which saw

the First Crusade as a model for righteous wars, whether they be past or contemporary conflicts. As the century progressed, bringing papal encouragement for further expeditions to the East, narratives of the First Crusade continue to serve this purpose.[358] It is the manner in which battle rhetoric would be used by those documenting holy wars of the mid to late twelfth century which is the subject of Chapters Four and Five.

358 John, 'Historical Truth and the Miraculous Past', p. 265.

4 Justice, Authority and Legitimate Violence in Holy War

Introduction

Chapters Two and Three considered the battle rhetoric of First Crusade narratives in order to examine the character and nature of this recurring rhetorical form in the first half of the twelfth century. It highlighted the extent to which the battle rhetoric of the early twelfth century resisted some aspects of previous typographical classification,[1] demonstrating the influence of crusading ideology upon the form and function of many motivational appeals. Moreover, in focusing upon orations from narratives which detailed the same events the previous two chapters were able to illustrate the variance in appeals from the same context.

Despite rhetorical *topoi* concerned with martial virtues being common, it cannot be said that the central concern of crusade oration authors was the celebration of such ideas. Prideful boasting in fact ran contrary to the wider explanatory framework of the First Crusade, wherein the development of Christian virtue was established in a more appropriate fashion, with such appeals often closely tied to more prominent spiritual ideals. While notions of divine aid, the victory-bringing cross and a chosen race overcoming enemies in battle were ancient, the penitential nature of the First Crusade was emphasized through battle rhetoric which deployed appeals to redemptive suffering and martyrdom, the salvific nature of the cross, *imitatio Christi* and the unity and reformed life of *ecclesia primitiva*.[2] Moreover, seemingly out of place appeals, such as those to wealth or glory, were often involved in broader didactic messages. This is crucial as First Crusade narratives and their orations would be used in the decades after their composition as models of righteous warfare. The fact that battle orations of First Crusade narratives, which were presented as taking place after the capture of Jerusalem, did not markedly differ from those

1 Bliese, 'Courage of the Nomans', pp. 3–4.

2 For the *ecclesia primitiva* as the basis for renewed Christian life, see Glenn Olsen, 'The Idea of the *Ecclesia Primitiva* in the Writings of the Twelfth-Century Canonists', *Traditio*, 25 (1969), pp. 61–86.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003044611-5

preceding also illustrates that, as the twelfth century continued, contemporaries perceived a link between the 1096–1099 campaign and the continual defence of the Latin East.[3]

Founded upon the close analysis of a single text, *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, this chapter will, through a comparative analysis involving a broader corpus, explore both continuity and change in the form and function of the prominent rhetorical appeals identified in Chapters Two and Three. In doing so, it will highlight the development of certain appeals common to First Crusade rhetoric, notably that of unity and right intention, which reflect a need to justify the expedition and defend the moral worthiness of its participants. The chapter will also explore the broader preoccupations of battle rhetoric in this period, which were heavily influenced by the development of canon law regarding warfare, evolving notions of justice and authority as well as the disastrous failure of the 1147–1149 campaign to the Holy Land.

The Context of De expugnatione Lyxnbonesi

Once victorious crusaders of the 1097–1099 campaign began returning to their homes around 1100, there emerged a 'third wave' of crusading enthusiasm inspired by the stories of Jerusalem's capture, with new armies departing for the East. Although far from lacking in numbers and organization, the so-called crusade of 1101 ended in catastrophe. This only served to cement the reputation of the 1097–99 campaign as being an endeavour directed by God, while the campaign led by men such as Willian of Aquitaine was deemed to have failed because of the sins of its participants.[4] The need to explain further disappointments, such as Bohemond of Taranto's 1106–1108 operation, prompted familiar questions of motivation and intention. Orderic Vitalis made his view clear when he attributed the collapse of Bohemond's campaign to the sins of greed for wealth and lust of the Westerners to take lands for themselves.[5]

Similar criticisms, which reflect the same ideology that inspired the didactic lessons to be found in a number of First Crusade battle orations, were levelled by Henry of Huntingdon at the Second Crusade. Henry contrasted the triumph of northern maritime crusaders, who assisted in the 1147 capture of Lisbon, to the miserable failure of the expedition to the Holy Land. Centrally, he juxtaposed the supposed humility and humble origins of the Anglo-Normans, Flemish and Germans, with the leaders of the expedition to the Holy Land:

3 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality,* p. 68.
4 Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, pp. 34–9.
5 OV, vi, pp. 102–5.

> In the same year, the armies of the emperor of Germany and the French king, which marched out with great pride under illustrious commanders, came to nothing because 'God despised them.' [...] Meanwhile, a naval force that was made up of ordinary, rather than powerful men, and was not supported by any great leader, except Almighty God, prospered a great deal better because they set out in humility. Truly 'God resists the proud, but gives grace to the humble.'[6]

While success was perhaps the ultimate sign of legitimacy for a crusading expedition, the question of how contemporaries viewed the relationship between the campaign against Lisbon and the expedition to the Holy Land, as well as the German campaign against the pagan Wends, remains a subject of debate. Giles Constable has argued that many contemporary chroniclers saw the Second Crusade as a planned assault on all non-Christian enemies, encompassing the fighting in the Levant, the Iberian Peninsula and against the pagan Slavs.[7] According to Constable, while a few contemporary or near-contemporary authors, such as Helmold of Bosau,[8] saw all three campaigns as a single whole, more drew links between two specific theatres.[9] While the attack on Lisbon was recognized as a Christian victory, the campaign's most detailed narrative makes clear that, unlike the campaign against the Wends in eastern Europe, the Lisbon campaign was a diversion from the central journey to the Holy Land. Thus, the very victory which ensured its assimilation into the expedition evidently required defence against those who would criticize the deviation.[10]

The internal divisions the narrative presents has been argued to reflect the lack of consensus among those who took part in the expedition regarding the notion of crusading, which has been called an ill-defined concept even in the mid-twelfth century;[11] and that *Lyxbonensi* is largely concerned with justifying the siege of Lisbon in the wake of its success, by emphasizing its crusading nature.[12] That the text was specifically worked or reworked from a shorter initial report, perhaps soon after the city's capture, seems likely.[13] In particular two long set-piece speeches, concerning the diversion of the

6 HH, pp. 752–3.

7 Giles Constable, 'The Second Crusade as Seen by Contemporaries', in Giles Constable, *Crusaders and Crusading in the Twelfth Century* (Farnham, 2008), pp. 236–9.

8 Mayer, *Crusades*, p. 99.

9 Constable, 'The Second Crusade', pp. 231–59.

10 Phillips, *The Second Crusade*, p. 142. Jonathan Phillips, 'The Ideas of Crusade and Holy War in De expugnatione Lyxbonesi (The Conquest of Lisbon)', in *The Holy Land, Holy Lands and Christian History*, ed. by R. N. Swanson (Woodbridge: 2000), p. 123.

11 Stephen Lay, 'Martyrs and the Cult of Henry the Crusader in Lisbon', *Portuguese Studies*, 24:1 (2008), pp. 8–9.

12 DEL, p. 16.

13 Phillips, 'The Ideas of Crusade and Holy War', pp. 124–5.

expedition and the dedication of the crusaders to their newly assumed cause, is in line with the presentation of *Lyxbonensi* as depicting a coincidental, or providential, diversion.[14] There is, however, evidence of preplanning that did not involve a formal agreement, including the meeting of Bernard of Clairvaux with the leader of the Flemish contingent Christian of Gistel during his preaching tour.[15] Phillips has also drawn attention to the timing of the expedition; the northern Europeans seemingly departed far ahead of schedule for a rendezvous with the armies of Louis and Conrad; there was also present a specialist siege engineer from Pisa, perhaps believed to be able to assist in overcoming the defences which had frustrated the 1142 attack.[16] The diversion was thus not perhaps as spontaneous as *Lyxbonensi* suggests.

Text

De expugnatione Lyxbonensi has been described as a historical memoire in epistolary form.[17] The text survives in only a single manuscript, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, No. 470, folios 125r–146r, and may once have been in the possession of the cathedral priory of Norwich.[18] The identity of the author has been the subject of considerable debate, with the letter beginning: 'To Osbert of Bawdsey, R. greeting.'[19] Harold Livermore has identified R. as Raol, an Anglo-French priest and, like Osbert of Bawdsey, an associate of the Glanville family.[20] Raol has also been identified as the 'certain priest' who exhorts the crusaders before the final assault on the city and, given his involvement in the negotiations of terms with Afonso and his ownership of a piece of the True Cross, was almost certainly a figure of importance.[21] Accurately dating the text has proved challenging, with MS Corpus Christi 470 being ascribed to the late-1160 s or early 1170 s, though it is likely that an earlier version was sent to East Anglia in 1147–1148 before the crusaders continued to the Levant. Phillips has suggested that the text may have been reworked sometime in the late-1150 s or early 1160 s, as a

14 Alan J. Forey, 'The Second Crusade: Scope and Objectives', *Durham University Journal*, 86 (1994) pp. 168–9. Christopher Tyerman, *England and the Crusades* (Chicago, MI, 1988), p. 33.

15 Thérèse de Hemptinne, Adriaan Verhulst and Lieve De Me, *De oorkonden der graven van Vlaaderen (Juli 1128–September 1191)* (Brussels, 2001), p. 152.

16 Phillips, *Second Crusade,* pp. 139–40.

17 DEL, p. 26.

18 DEL, p. 27.

19 DEL, p. 53.

20 Harold Livermore, "The Conquest of Lisbon' and Its Author', *Portuguese Studies*, 6 (1990). For an alternate explanation of the provenance of *De expugnatione*, see Jonathan Wilson, 'Enigma of *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi*', *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 9:1 (2017), pp. 99–129.

21 DEL, p. xxi.

blueprint for a successful crusading expedition, in an attempt to address the weak response to crusading appeals in 1157 and 1159.[22]

The text displays the author's considerable education, featuring extensive scriptural quotations, but also references to classical works. Beyond this, a knowledge of both contemporary theology and canon law is evident, with the text incorporating the writings of Gratian and Ivo of Chartres. Moreover, the Incarnation theology found in the pre-battle sermon of *Lyxbonensi* reflects contemporary debates on Christ's humanity in the Paris schools of the early twelfth century, engendered by treatises such as Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo.* As will be demonstrated, a major theme of *Cur Deus Homo*, that of God's justice, is shared by *Lyxbonensi.*[23] The influence of Bernard of Clairvaux's *De laude novae militiae* is discernible, as is the First Crusade history of Guibert of Nogent and perhaps others.[24]

Many of these extra-textual influences are detectable from the themes, language and exegesis of *Lyxbonensi*'s four long set-piece orations, perhaps the targets of the most extensive textual reworkings.[25] Of the four long orations in *Lyxbonensi*, the first is delivered by the Bishop of Oporto, Peter Pitões, to the crusaders after their arrival in Spain, wherein the crusaders are urged to join King Afonso in attacking Lisbon.[26] The second speech is delivered by Hervey Glanville and is concerned with ensuring the Anglo-Norman contingent continues to support the campaign collectively despite the misgivings of a group who threaten to abandon the endeavour and continue on to the Holy Land.[27] The third speech is not directed at crusaders but to the Muslim inhabitants of Lisbon, being delivered by the archbishop of Braga, wherein the defenders of the city are encouraged to abandon it to the Christian forces.[28] The fourth speech is delivered by 'a certain priest', believed to be Raol, before the final assault on the city and is the only instance of battle rhetoric in *Lyxbonensi*,[29] although the first and second speeches do include hortatory content and display a number of ideas and themes common to battle rhetoric. The content of these four speeches has previously been analyzed by Jonathan Phillips, who has argued for their unusual consistency, for what have been previously understood to be reports of genuine speeches, delivered over the course of the expedition. As has been argued in Chapter One, medieval understandings of truth accommodated invented speeches that were carrying meaning through content which was

22 Phillips, *Second Crusade*, pp. 136–7.

23 Bernard J. D. van Vreeswijk, 'Interpreting Anselm's thought about divine justice: dealing with loose ends', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 69:4 (2016), pp. 417–31.

24 Phillips, 'Crusade and Holy War', pp. 128–9.

25 Phillips, *Second Crusade*, pp. 139–140. Phillips, 'Crusade and Holy War', pp. 124–5.

26 DEL, pp. 70–85.

27 DEL, pp. 104–11.

28 DEL, pp. 114–25.

29 DEL, pp. 146–59.

apt and verisimilar rather than a reproduction of 'the literal truth'. A marginal note of the text acknowledges this very phenomenon, admitting that the speech given by Hervey of Glanville were not his exact words.[30] Phillips' analysis of these speeches has identified a number of themes which, while being present in the battle rhetoric of First Crusade narratives, are given far greater weight in the speeches and broader narrative of *Lyxbonensi*, specifically those of discipline, repentance, unity and right intention.[31] It is the place, form and function of these themes, as well as others, in contrast to the motivational appeals of other crusading and non-crusading orations, to which this chapter now turns.

Themes

Martial Virtue

While First Crusade battle rhetoric often deemphasized appeals to prowess, calls for bravery and praise of military virtues, *Lyxbonensi* makes even less use of such appeals, which never appear without religious reference. In the opening lines of the siege speech, the author pairs a call for bravery with an immediate reassurance that supernatural aid will serve as comfort (*solatium*) to their human weakness (*fragilitatis humane*).[32] Later in this same oration, a call for courage is similarly reinforced with the notion of divine aid:

> Brothers, be not afraid; shun discouragement; despise terror. If our God has prevented you from entering this city after so long and costly an effort, assuredly he has done this in order that continuous labour might strengthen your patience, and that the same, being strengthened, might make you the better tested of perseverance.[33]

This form of appeal echoes strongly the framework First Crusade authors often constructed through battle rhetoric, wherein victory was God-given, defeats were the result of sin and poor moral conduct, and hardship was necessary in order to adequately test the crusaders.[34] A multifaceted formulation was obviously required to cope with the variance in crusade success, and accommodate both the need to rouse crusading enthusiasm, but also to avoid fatalism. This active piety, under divine direction, was not only demonstrated through the battle rhetoric of the First Crusade but also

30 DEL, p. 104.

31 Bull has more recently raised the problem of privileging one of these themes over another in what is a complex text, with a tone not solely defensive, but also celebratory. Bull, *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative*, p. 133, n. 20.

32 DEL, p. 146.

33 DEL, pp. 154–5.

34 DEL, p. 154.

Lyxbonensi, which makes clear that, following appropriate hardships, God will supply the required courage and strength to his people.[35] Beyond these examples *Lyxbonensi* only appeals to courage in order to elaborate on the theme of righteous intention. The Bishop of Oporto, following a detailed exposition on the theology and legality of making war against the Muslims of Lisbon, claims:

> Therefore, brother, take courage with these arms, courage, that is to say, either to defend the fatherland in war against barbarians or to ward off enemies at home, or to defend comrades from robbers; for such courage is full righteousness.[36]

The relative dearth of even common, undeveloped appeals to martial virtue in *Lyxbonensi* is best understood as part of a broader conceptual framework similar to that which shaped much of the battle rhetoric of early First Crusade narratives. As with many accounts of the First Crusade, *Lyxbonensi* makes clear the problem of victorious soldiers being marred by the sin of pride and illustrates forcefully the relationship between sin and defeat.[37] However, the fighting ability of crusading soldiers is evidently not relegated to the same position it is in the work of, for example, Guibert of Nogent, being required to ward off enemies and defend *socios*. The appeals to martial virtue in *Lyxbonensi* seemingly reflect a greater anxiety regarding the justification of violence than many First Crusade narratives.

For these reasons, *Lyxbonensi* invites comparison with another account of righteous warfare against an enemy both criminal and sacrilegious, produced in the Anglo-Norman world early in the second half of the twelfth century.[38] The *Relatio de Standardo* of Aelred of Rievaulx is the longest near-contemporary treatment of the so-called Battle of the Standard (22 August 1138). Centrally, the *Relatio* serves to praise the devout Anglo-Norman army, with the pious alliance of northern English Sees and barons narratively contrasted with the barbaric and blasphemous soldiers of David I, particularly his Gallovidian troops. One of the ways in which this was achieved was through appeals to martial virtues.

Despite its length,[39] the central speech of the *Relatio* by Walter Espec, like *Lyxbonensi*, contains remarkably few instances of martial rhetoric. Moreover, it is made clear early in the Anglo-Norman oration that victory does not depend on strength (*viribus*),[40] but on righteous prayer and an

35 DEL, pp. 158–9.
36 DEL, pp. 80–1.
37 Phillips, *Second Crusade*, pp. 163–6.
38 For the dating of the *Relatio* see, Dutton, *Historical Works,* p. 24.
39 RS, pp. 185–9.
40 RS, p. 185.

honest cause.[41] However, even these references are undeveloped and overshadowed by the motivational appeals referencing the just cause of the Anglo-Normans or the divine aid they can expect. Moreover, when confronted by the fierce Gallovidians, Walter claims that it is not courage driving them, but an 'irrational contempt of death.'[42] Even more striking is the fact that, while Walter's speech barely involved any appeals to martial ideals, the counter oration delivered by the Gallovidians contains nothing but martial appeals:

> We have iron sides, breasts of brass, and minds devoid of fear; our feat have never known flight, and our backs have never felt a wound. How did their breastplates benefit the Gauls at Clitheroe? Did these men, unarmed, as they say, not force them to throw away their breastplates, forget their helmets and abandon their shields? Let your prudence, O King, then see what it means to trust in those things that are more a burden than a help in adversity! At Clitheroe we brought back a victory over men clothed in mail; today, using strength of mind as our shield, we will overthrow these men too with our lances.[43]

This bold statement results in even greater division not only between the unruly Gallovidians but between the Norman nobleman and knights in David's host. In this way, Aelred's characterization of the Gallovidians is not simply reflecting contemporary criticism of certain practices of 'Celtic warfare'.[44] In recording the Gallovidian insistence on taking their place in the front line, and the resulting squabbling involving the knights and nobles in David's army, Aelred characterizes the Gallovidians as wishing for a place of honour on the field that any professional arms-bearer in the Anglo-Norman and Frankish world would have understood. Through this particular construction Aelred draws a line between the gruesome atrocities he details and the wider preoccupations of contemporary combatants which, for Aelred, are an obvious source of disharmony. It is, moreover, the case that Aelred's disregard for praising martial virtues was likely not prompted by the actual circumstances of the battle, since Henry of Huntingdon includes an oration in his account of the Standard which is almost the antithesis of Aelred's. Comparatively, the speech of Ralph Noel (as it is rendered by Henry of Huntingdon) focuses far more on motivational appeals to martial values, with the prelate asking 'of what avail, then, is

41 RS, p. 185.

42 RS, p. 186. Dutton, *Historical Works*, pp. 253–4.

43 RS, p. 190. Dutton, *Historical Works*, p. 258.

44 William Aird, 'Sweet civility and barbarous rudeness: A View from the Frontier, Abbot Ailred of Rievaulx and the Scots', in *Imagining Frontiers, Contesting Identities*, ed. by Steven G. Ellis and Lud'a Klusáková (Pisa, 2007), p. 64.

ancestral glory, regular training and military discipline if, when you are few, you do not conquer many?'[45] This is all the more striking for the fact that, while a speech delivered by the layman Walter says next to nothing about martial virtues, being instead filled with appeals to justice and divine direction, in Ralph's speech reference to military values and the practicality of military equipment far outweigh reference to the divine. This runs contrary to the formulation of the rhetorical tradition of plausibility outlined by Bachrach,[46] and implies that far from merely writing motivations that would have been the most appropriate, Aelred crafted his battle rhetoric purposely to convey certain ideas regarding warfare.

Aelred involves the construction of war, presented in the *Relatio*, within a wider concern for suffering and the consequences of sin; indeed the importance of remembering the atrocities of the Scots, which would usually deserve no place in history, is a direct instruction of Walter Espec.[47] It is an unjust and improperly persecuted war which, for Aelred, has led the otherwise virtuous David I astray, and a significant amount of the *Relatio* narrative is dedicated to an oration by Robert de Bruce, who implores David to change his ways. This reform in behaviour is implied by the final lines of the twelfth-century manuscript, wherein Aelred returns to the motif of military equipment, relating a story of the defeated Prince Henry encountering a beggar after having fled the battlefield. Symbolically rejecting warfare, in a manner reminiscent of St. Martin of Tours, Henry gives his breastplate to the beggar claiming it has been a burden to him, expressing hope it will serve the pauper in his need.[48] That moral reform and a particular deployment of appeals to martial virtue are so entangled in Aelred's *Relatio* illuminates how the particularities of martial appeals in *Lyxbonensi* could serve to reinforce its own messages of moral reform.

However, a broader trend against appeals to martial virtue and prowess is detectable across extant battle orations from the second half of the twelfth century, prior to 1187. This is both the case in ecclesiastically focused orations, such as that delivered by Albero of Trier at the climax of the *Gesta Alberonis*, which contains no such appeals,[49] as well as those which sought to lionize powerful laymen, such as two orations delivered by Frederick I in the *Gesta Friderici imperatoris*, which are likewise entirely devoid of such motivators.[50] The battle rhetoric of Lisiard of Tours, a churchman who was Dean of Laon between 1153–1163 and who around

45 HH, p. 715.

46 Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility', pp. 17–18.

47 RS, p. 197.

48 RS, p. 198.

49 GA, p. 256.

50 Georg Waitz and Bernhard von Simson (ed.), *Ottonis et Rahewini Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*, Monumenta Germaniae historica Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi, 96 (Hannover: Hahn, 1912), pp. 148, 202–4.

that time wrote an account of the First Crusade heavily influenced by Fulcher of Chartres, actually removes instances of martial appeals from his account of a harangue by Baldwin I and drawn from Fulcher. Lisiard instead adds details on the hardships the crusaders have faced, their devotion, and how fighting for a heavenly cause is far more reassuring than fighting for earthly reasons.[51] On the other hand, this trend was far from universal. Helmold of Bosau's *Chronica Sclavorum* makes far greater use of martial appeals, in comparison to the works of Aelred of Rievaulx, or the author of *Lyxbonensi*.[52] In detailing the 1147 campaign against the pagan Wends, Helmold recounts an event deemed worthy of remembrance, in which a priest named Gerlav exhorts a group of Frisian soldiers under siege by a force of Slavs who, having their enemies trapped, send an offer of surrender. Gerlav's oration implores the Frisians to refuse surrender and to 'try your strength yet a little while and join battle with the enemy', before continuing in this manner:

> For so long as this wall surrounds us, we are masters of our arms and of our weapons; life is for us founded in hope, but nothing is left us unarmed other than ignominious death. Rather, plunge into their vitals your sword, which of their own accord they bespeak for themselves, and be avengers of your blood. Let them taste your valour. Let them not go back with a bloodless victory.[53]

While the gruesome details of Gerlav's oration are reminiscent of how Aelred describes the atrocities of the Scots, Helmold far outstrips Aelred, as well as the author of *Lyxbonensi*, in the bellicose nature of his battle rhetoric. This emphasizes chiefly the divergence of circumstance. While the position of Aelred, in detailing a conflict he depicts as akin to civil strife, wherein a supporter of the reigning king of England, Henry II, was defeated, was a complex one, Helmold wrote in a tradition of history which praised those who had made war against eastern European pagans, in the tradition of Adam of Bremen and Widukind of Corvey. The author of *Lyxbonensi* was not in such an unambiguous position, despite detailing a war against Muslim opponents, because the Lisbon campaign had been a diversion from the ultimately disastrous campaign to the Holy Land. When faced with such ambiguity, a need for clarity in how the warfare being narrated by *Lyxbonensi* was to be understood by their audiences, rather than simply being a matter of more forceful propagandistic justification, lies at the heart of their depictions of martial virtues.

51 LTC, 1603. FC, pp. 411–2.

52 HB, pp. 76, 79–80, 81, 125, 196–7.

53 HB, p. 125. Francis Joseph Tschan (trans.), *The Chronicle of the Slavs, by Helmold, Priest of Bosau* (New York, 1935), p. 179.

Compared to appeals to courage, prowess and so forth, motivational appeals to notions of honour and glory, and their antithesis shame, are similarly deployed by *Lyxbonensi*, and often for the same moral or spiritual ends. After promising the protection of guardian angels, Raol's oration draws upon Scripture, associating honour (*honorem*) and dishonour with truth (*veritati*) and the impact of these notions upon their relationship with Christ, rather than as the earthly recognition of prowess that the crusaders might enjoy.[54] Raol's harangue also includes several appeals involving glory or the promise of glory, which also figure throughout *Lyxbonensi*. Most notably at the climax of Raol's oration, glory figures as part of an assurance of heavenly reward.[55] Subsequently, he tells the crusaders they should be 'certain of victory' and thus 'fall upon the enemy, the rewards of victory over whom are eternal glory.'[56] The notion of glory figures a third time at the conclusion of the oration, in a passage heavily influenced by the language of Psalm 113 and 78, where Raol expresses hope that God will 'direct us in accordance with his will and receive us with glory.'[57] Utilizing a recognizable exegetical gloss, the author has the Bishop of Oporto make clear why the crusaders will be honoured: 'And truly will that prophecy be fulfilled in you in which to the praise and honour of the valour and glory of the sons of God it is said, 'How one should chase a thousand and two put ten thousand to flight.'[58]

In contrast, Helmold employs the motivational appeal to glory often without religious reference, evidently finding nothing inappropriate in displaying warriors as highly concerned with gaining glory and avoiding shame to their reputations in warfare against the pagans of eastern Europe. In detailing an expedition by the Obotrite prince Henry against the Rani, Henry praises his Saxon soldiers for always having brought him much gain and glory. The response of his soldiers expresses not only a desire for a glorious death, but a clear concern for their reputation.[59]

Conversely, *Lyxbonensi* associates shame with the proposed abandonment of the Lisbon expedition. Moreover, its author presents the idea of death before reaching the Holy Land as glorious: 'Even though I remain silent concerning the sin of a violated association, you will become to objects of universal infamy and shame. Through fear of a glorious death you have withdrawn your support from your associates.'[60] Within this context, shame is the consequence both of the failure of the crusaders to act in unity and of the breaking of their sworn association, the oath of

54 DEL, pp. 146–9.
55 DEL, pp. 156–7.
56 DEL, pp. 156–7.
57 DEL, pp. 158–9.
58 DEL, pp. 82–5. Deuteronomy 32:30.
59 HB, p. 80.
60 DEL, pp. 106–7.

which included a vow of pilgrimage to the Holy Land,[61] this tying social and spiritual failure together. Notions of honour and glory are likewise involved in this two-fold transgression. As Hervey claims it is because of a 'lust for honour and glory – envy has crept among us.'[62] In the same way that boastful bellicosity is presented in Aelred's *Relatio* as a source of disunity for the Scottish soldiery, so too is a desire for honour and glory a source of disunity for the Anglo-Normans of *Lyxbonensi*. The place of appeals to martial virtue, as well as notions of honour and glory are thus formulated in *Lyxbonensi* in a manner which reinforced the text's central themes. This can be set within a broader scope of battle orations, wherein can be recognized a not insignificant dearth of such appeals, or in the case of Aelred and *Lyxbonensi* their negative aspects.

Gentes and nationes

In Hervey's oration, attempting to reconcile a divergent faction of Anglo-Normans to the proposal of attacking Lisbon, repeated reference is made to the honour and reputation of the *gens* of the dissenters:

> For now that so great a diversity of peoples is bound with us under the law of a sworn association, and considering that we find nothing that in its dealings which can justly be made a subject of accusation or disparagement, each of us ought to do his utmost in order that in the future no stain of disgrace shall adhere to us who are of the same stock and blood. Nay more, recalling the virtues of ancestors, we ought to strive to increase the honour and glory of our race rather than cover tarnished glory with the rags of malice. For the glorious deeds of the ancients kept in memory by posterity are the marks of both affection and honour. If you show yourselves worthy of the ancients, honour and glory will be yours, but if unworthy, then disgraceful reproaches.[63]

Similarly, Hervey's final plea to his fellow Anglo-Normans is for them to 'have mercy on your comrades', and: 'Spare shame to your race. Yield to the counsels of honour.'[64] Phillips has argued that this speech, with its references to the deeds of *veterum*, was particularly influenced by the papal bull *Quantum praedecessores* which, in calling upon the arms-bearers of Christendom, particularly France and Italy, not to allow the 'things acquired by the efforts of your fathers' to be lost, was aimed at stoking the fires

61 Constable, 'The Second Crusade', p. 238.
62 DEL, pp. 106–7.
63 DEL, pp. 104–7.
64 DEL, pp. 108–9.

of honour and glory amongst the nobility.[65] Moreover, it has been forcefully demonstrated how the First Crusade had become a reference point for aristocratic honour, with certain families having well established crusading traditions by a few decades into the twelfth century and participation in crusading often appealing particularly to those connected by networks of kinship.[66] However, the extent of the bull's influence is questionable. Despite the commonalities of certain important themes recognizable across the four extensive speeches of *Lyxbonensi*,[67] there is not a single reference to the reputation, achievements or abilities of any *gentes* or *nationes* in the text's pre-battle sermon. This is in stark contrast to Aelred, who in the *Relatio* deploys appeals to past Norman achievements which are notable for their length and detail. For example, the army is told there is nothing to fear from the Scots because of the past victories that had been won over them as well:

> These, these are the men who once thought they would not resist us but yield, when William the conqueror of England, penetrated Lothain, Calatria, and Scotland as far as Abernethy and when that warlike Malcolm became ours by surrender- and now they are challenging their own conquerors, their masters in war![68]

Given the emphasis on prowess as part of what R. H. C. Davis described as the 'Norman myth',[69] the absence of Norman ancestral achievement from the pre-battle oration of *Lyxbonensi* is perplexing. However, a closer examination of how these notions are deployed within the text in comparison with Aelred's *Relatio* actually reveals points of correspondence that serve to clarify their intention.

Centrally, both texts employ appeals to Norman achievement in order to further themes of divine direction and righteous intention. As has been established, neither text is particularly concerned with motivational appeals to martial prowess. Moreover, although Walter's speech makes much of past Norman victories the wider text has a far from unqualified disdain for the Scots. For all of Aelred's contrasting of the Anglo-Norman and Scottish armies the Battle of the Standard has been described as a tragic conflict between old friends.[70] Aelred references English assistance given to David I

65 Phillips, *Second Crusade*, p. 29, 280.

66 Jonathan Riley-Smith*, The First Crusaders, 1095–1131* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 9, 109. Jonathan Riley-Smith, 'Family Traditions and Participation in the Second Crusade', in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, ed. by Michael Gervers (New York, 1992), pp. 101–8. Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 2012).

67 Phillips, 'Crusade and Holy War', pp. 125–6.

68 RS, p. 186. Dutton, *Historical Works*, p. 256.

69 Ralph. H. C. Davis, *The Normans and Their Myth* (London, 1976).

70 Robert L. Graeme Ritchie, *The Normans in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1954), p. xvi.

in Robert de Bruce's speech to the king, in his attempt to stop him from joining battle.[71] While absent from Walter's speech, some of the past Norman victories that the *Relatio* celebrates were victories the Normans and Scots had enjoyed together.

One of Walter's motivational appeals to Norman past victories stands out from the others, in that it references conflicts that occurred outside the Anglo-Norman world: 'Who subdued Apulia, Sicily, Calabria if not your Normans? Did not both commanders [Emperors], on the same day and at almost the same hour, turn their backs to the Normans when one fought against a father, the other against a son.'[72]

The tale of Robert Guiscard and his son Bohemond going to battle against the Holy Roman and Byzantine emperors on the same day had, according to Davis, caught up with the 'saga of the Norman race' by the middle of the twelfth century.[73] While Aelred was clearly well aware of Norman achievement, it is questionable that the *Relatio*, and perhaps *Lyxbonensi*, should be understood as reflecting the Norman myth. Two of the four elements that Davis identified as being central to the Norman myth, those being an attachment to Normandy itself, which is included in Hervey's oration,[74] and an emphasis on the Scandinavian ancestry of the Normans[75] are entirely absent from Walter's speech. Aelred was himself not a Norman but an Englishman and depicts enemies referring to the Anglo-Normans not as Normans at all, but as Gauls.[76] Moreover, the notion of the Normans' tremendous fighting prowess is far from prominent in the *Relatio*, and totally absent from Raol's oration. Where such appeals do feature in the *Relatio*'s battle rhetoric is in the oration of the despicable Gallovidians. Recounting past Norman victories in the *Relatio*, therefore, seems more to do with emphasizing two other themes of the text, those being the value of history and the divinely directed nature of warfare, wherein the Normans have been given victory for their role in the punishment of sinners, than with celebrating Norman prowess.

While Hervey's oration shows a concern for racial reputation, there is no recounting of past victories. Moreover, the driving force of Hervey's message seems rather distinct from that of *Quantum praedecessores*. The Anglo-Normans are not being harangued to divert to Lisbon in order to defend the acquisitions of their fathers; indeed, in being concerned with the state of the Holy Land Pope Eugenius's bull could have been cited against the proposed diversion. The emulation Hervey is looking for is energetic opportunism, in

71 RS, pp. 192–3, 5.
72 RS, p. 186. Dutton, *Historical Works*, p. 253.
73 Davis, *The Normans and their Myth*, pp. 65–6.
74 DEL, pp. 108–9.
75 Davis, *The Normans and their Myth*, p. 68.
76 RS, p. 187.

the manner of *veterum* not *patriarum*. Indeed, Hervey contrasts his men with their colleague *gentes* as often as with any predecessors.[77] Furthermore, *Quantum praedecessores* was initially aimed specifically at the higher French nobility, for whom the seeds of the later flourishing notion of *strenuitas patrum*[78] had long been planted, and while certain leaders of the expedition could boast crusading ancestry, such men were not the constitutors of the opposing faction Hervey's oration ultimately reconciles. Additionally, it is certainly far from necessary to suppose ideas of ancestral achievement in the rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi* were drawn from *Quantum praedecessores*, given the presence of such notions in narratives of the First Crusade. It may also be the case that Hervey's criticism of the dissenters that their pilgrimage 'certainly appears not to be founded on charity, for love is not in you',[79] likewise reflects ideas which had, since the turn of the twelfth century, been part of narrative constructions of crusading, rather than *Quantum praedecessores*. It is certainly the case that, despite ecclesiastical attempts to replace *imitatio Christi* with *strenuitas patrum*, as the driving force of crusading preaching, in part through papal encyclicals, older ideas of crusading endured well into the closing decades of the twelfth century.[80] Moreover, where the notion of *strenuitas patrum* does appear in the battle rhetoric of this period, for example in an oration in William of Tyre, it is not done so in reference to ancestors who took part in the First Crusade, but is actually invoked by Duke Godfrey during the First Crusade.[81] More broadly, the place of appeals to *gentes* or *nationes* in *Lyxbonensi* is in a way easily compared to their place in narratives of the First Crusade. In reinforcing unity, this speech ultimately shares a prominent concern of First Crusade battle rhetoric. Just as the dearth of appeals to a range of *gentes* or *nationes* served to amalgamate the diverse factions of crusaders under the umbrella of Franks, who were defined by their unifying faith, so too does the Bishop of Oporto describe the various northern crusade contingents as a single *gens*, '*cuius est Dominus Deus eius*.'[82]

Surveying more broadly such notions in comparison with *Lyxbonensi* emphasizes how what may be perceived as generic and conveniently applicable appeals, that reflected a bellicose 'us-versus-them' mentality, are often heavily dependent upon context and which, as Aelred's *Relatio* illustrates, are potentially fraught politically. No such appeals are found in the extended oration of Balderich's *Gesta Alberonis*, where the conflict runs across lines of ecclesiastical and secular authority, rather than between

77 DEL, pp. 106–9.
78 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, pp. 115–6.
79 DEL, pp. 108–9.
80 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, pp. 115–7.
81 WT, pp. 275–6.
82 DEL, p. 70.

gentes. However, even authors whose rhetoric reflects their wider concern with *regnum* or *imperium*, do not frequently employ these notions in extended or detailed forms. An oration by Otto of Friesing references the *patria* of Frederick's soldiers, but the appeal is not developed further.[83] Race and racial division is, however, a prominent appeal in a speech by the Slavic prince Pribislav, as presented by Helmold of Bosau. The oration opens with a lament for the oppression of the Slavs and the settlement of Flemings and Hollanders, Saxons and Westphalians in their land.[84] Pribislav later addresses his men: 'Again pluck up your courage, therefore, O men who are the remnants of Slavic race, resume your daring spirit', before concluding with a call for vengeance.[85] However, it is telling that Pribislav's oration is ultimately unsuccessful, with the prince's soldiers subsequently withdrawing from their siege, supposedly intimidated by their enemies.[86]

Thus, while the recounting of past victories, or appeals to the reputation or honour of a particular *gens* or *gentes* are present across a number of battle orations from diverse narratives written from 1145–1187, the form of these appeals varied considerably. As with First Crusade narratives appeals to *gentes* or *nationes* perhaps were understood as conflicting with the more crucial notion of unity, and there is certainly a notable absence of these ideas from the battle rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi*. However, the broader trend against these ideas can be understood as reflecting the same pattern which saw appeals to martial virtue cede ground to more frequent and detailed appeals to justice and righteous intention, as discussed later.

Material Reward

Like a number of First Crusade narratives, *Lyxbonensi* associates greed with disunity, with Hervey of Glanville claiming that 'the mere desire of booty, yet to be acquired' had influenced those looking to abandon the campaign 'at the cost of eternal dishonour.'[87] Similarly, the orator priest warns against greed in his pre-battle sermon, saying: 'Brothers, trust not in oppression, and become not vain in robbery; but trust in the Lord and he shall give thee the desires of thine heart.'[88]

Given that *Lyxbonensi* does not shy away from the realities of maritime crusading, which often involved raiding costal settlements,[89] the fact that such a warning appears in its only pre-battle speech illustrates a serious concern over accusations of greed on the part of those who supported the

83 Waitz, *Ottonis et Rahewini*, p. 148.
84 HB, pp. 196–7.
85 HB, pp. 196–7. Tschan, *Chronicle of the Slavs*, p. 256.
86 HB, pp. 196–7.
87 DEL, pp. 106–9.
88 DEL, pp. 152–5.
89 Constable, 'The Second Crusade', p. 237.

diversion to Lisbon, as well as a wider perceived tension between the expectations of spiritual and earthly reward.[90] The extended discussions between Afonso and the crusaders concerning the material rewards they would receive has convinced some commentators that fighting for loot was a necessary motivator because many were unconvinced of the spiritual merits of fighting in Iberia.[91] However, like many First Crusade narratives, *Lyxbonensi* reconciles seemingly dichotomous motivations. Indeed, through the extended passages concerning the crusaders' pact with Afonso, its set-piece orations and its broader presentation of wealth, *Lyxbonensi* makes a much greater effort than many First Crusade accounts to construct a didactic narrative concerned with war spoils, centred on Hervey's Anglo-Normans.

The Bishop of Oporto opens his sermon with several passages which involve riches (*divitias*) with righteous intention and presents wealth acquired with such intention as God-given, and purposeful.[92] The matter of wealth is soon raised again, as part of an extended commendation of the 'honours and dignities' the crusaders have left behind in order to pursue their pilgrimage. The notion that the crusaders have actually forsaken worldly wealth, and only now require riches in order to pursue their pious desires is foundational to how the matter of spoils is subsequently presented. Afonso is reported to have claimed he did not expect to convince the crusaders to join him with gifts, because they were wealthy men and the Portuguese were impoverished from constant battle against the Moors. Instead, the king supposedly appealed to their piety.[93] That this piety might have actually convinced the crusaders against the proposed diversion was addressed by the Bishop of Oporto, who stressed the need for the crusaders to perform good works on the way to the earthly Jerusalem, so that they might reach the heavenly Jerusalem.[94] Without a hint of irony, *Lyxbonensi* instead frames the desire of William Viel's faction to continue onto Jerusalem as being born of greed, being unwilling to bear the expense of the endeavour, and wishing to instead to extort easy wealth from merchant ships.[95]

While the influence of canon law on *Lyxbonensi* will be discussed later, it is important to illustrate how the matter of spoils was involved in the broader framework influenced by canonists of the twelfth century and earlier. Bishop Peter makes clear in his sermon that while it was not sinful to wage war, it was sinful to do so for the sake of plunder.[96] That proper intention was necessary for a just war to take place was advanced by

90 DEL, p. xix.
91 DEL, pp. 99–115. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, p. 78.
92 DEL, pp. 70–1.
93 DEL, p. 98.
94 DEL, pp. 78–9. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, p. 78.
95 DEL, pp. 101–3.
96 DEL, pp. 82–3.

Churchmen as far back as Augustine, whose writings on warfare were made increasingly accessible in the twelfth century through the work of Gratian and the so-called Decretists. That warriors had to be of worthy character to pursue a just war was, for example, revived by the work of Rufinus in 1157, in a treatment upon Gratian's *Causa* 23.[97] The influence of *Causa* 23 can also be detected in the dialogue between Archbishop John of Braga and a Muslim elder of Lisbon, prior to the commencement of the siege. In this encounter, the archbishop makes clear that, by an understanding of natural justice (*iustitia naturalis*) and the inborn kindness of Christians, the Muslims of Lisbon would not be despoiled if they would leave the Christian cities and lands they occupied.[98] Similarly, Augustine's definition of just war cited by Gratian in *Causa* 23 involved a story found in Joshua 8, concerning Joshua's siege of the city of Ai. As well as being undertaken at the demand of a legitimate authority, the war Joshua fought was deemed just by Augustine because it sought the recovery of lost property and the punishment of the criminals responsible.[99]

That the punishment of sin, ultimately rooted in Augustine, was still essential to a Decretist conception of just war illustrates how there was no clear distinction between the flourishing canon law of institutions, such as the school of Bologna, and moral theology, at least in terms of understanding mid-twelfth-century warfare, if not in fields such as civil law.[100] Moreover, this lack of distinction is demonstrated throughout *Lyxbonensi*. The speech of Archbishop John, as well as the response from the Muslim elder, blends discussion of historical ownership, property and liberties with issues of right intention, virtues and vices. Similarly, prior to warning the crusaders against waging war for plunder Bishop Peter delivers an extended rhetorical acclamation on the transformation of crusaders from men 'employed with arms and the sword' who pillaged, and committed 'other misdeeds of soldiers', to men who have changed their purpose but not their actions:

> In you the Lord has smitten Saul and raised up Paul. The flesh of Saul and Paul was the same, but not the disposition of the mind, for it was completely transformed. Behold how pious, how just, how merciful is God! God has taken nothing from you: he has permitted the same enterprise on behalf of your country, only your purpose has changed.[101]

97 Heinrich Singer (ed.), *Die Summa Decretorum Des Magister Rufinus* (Paderborn, 1902), pp. 403–4. Russell, *Just War*, p. 87.

98 Christianorum innata benignitas, pp. DEL, p. 114–7.

99 Russell, *Just War*, p. 90.

100 Russell, *Just War*, pp. 92–3. Anne J. Duggan, 'Justinian's Laws, not the Lord's': Eugenius III and the learned laws', in *Pope Eugenius III (1145–1153): The First Cistercian Pope*, ed. by Iben Fonnesberg-Schmidt and Andrew Jotischky (Amsterdam, 2018), pp. 27–68.

101 DEL, pp. 82–3.

This emphasis on moral reform in *Lyxbonensi* ultimately serves to vindicate the Anglo-Norman contingent who, following the capture of the city, resist greed and the urge to pillage which gripped the men of Cologne and the Flemings, who 'observed not the bond of their oath or plighted faith.'[102]

While the emphasis on right intention in *Lyxbonensi* is well recognized,[103] and certainly accounts for the dearth of appeals to material wealth and concern over the notion of war spoils more broadly, it is also possible to set the text within a wider trend against such notions in battle rhetoric of the period 1144–1187. Aelred nowhere utilizes this appeal, and both *Relatio* and *Genealogia* identify the enemy as thieves.[104] Spoils are likewise absent from the pre-battle speech of the *Gesta Alberonis* as well as the orations found in *Gesta Friderici*. The later of the two speeches, penned by Rahewin, includes a specific denial that the forces of the emperor are fighting out of greed.[105] In Helmold of Bosau's *Chronica*, greed constitutes a major theme in the narrative of pagan conversion. While Helmold is keen to praise the Saxons for their valour, he also highlights their avarice, which he claimed was the cause of unnecessary violence and a great hindrance to the conversion of the Slavs, his central concern, which was likewise referenced by Adam of Bremen.[106] Moreover, following his description of the 1147 crusade expedition against the Prolabian Slavs, which is recorded as failing to convert pagans or prevent them from raiding Christian Danes, Helmold describes how the rule of Henry the Lion over the Slavs was both heavy handed and driven by greed.[107] No such motivations are present in the battle rhetoric of William of Tyre. Lisiard invokes the notion of earthly wealth only to stress the emptiness of such promises.[108]

This trend marks a departure from the battle rhetoric of the late-eleventh and early twelfth century, where appeals to material wealth appear with greater frequency and in many cases, particularly in the context of crusading, are developed in such a way as to reconcile such promises with an explanatory framework that had moral and didactic functions, emphasizing faith and good intentions. Across such a broad range of texts this phenomenon is difficult to accurately account for; however, it is evident that

102 DEL, pp. 176–7.

103 Phillips, 'Crusading and Holy War', p. 126. Susanna A. Throop, 'Christian Community and the Crusades: Religious and Social Practices in the *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*' in *The Haskins Society Journal 24: 2012 Studies in Medieval History*, ed. by William North and Laura Gathagan (Woodbridge, 2013).

104 RS, p. 187. Aelred of Rievaulx, 'Genealogia regum Anglorum' in *Beati Aelredi Abbatis Rievallensis Opera Omnia*, PL, 195 (Paris, 1855), p. 721.

105 GA, p. 256. Waitz, *Ottonis et Rahewini*, p. 148, 203.

106 HB, pp. 41–44, 48–9, 51–2. Tschan, *Chronicle of the Slavs,* pp. 30–1. Bernhard Schmeidler (ed.), *Magistri Adam Bremensis gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum* (Hanover, 1917), p. 166.

107 HB, pp. 126–7, 132–3.

108 LTC, 1603.

during the period with which this chapter is concerned, a decline in the number of appeals to material wealth, military prowess and national reputation, or at the very least an awareness of the negative aspects of such motivators, is set alongside a trend for authors to devote an increasing amount of attention to explicit appeals concerning the just nature of the conflict being fought.

Justice and Vengeance

The great compilation work assembled by Gratian in around 1140[109] has been described as a watershed in the history of canon law, heralding a new era of systematic canonical jurisprudence.[110] In the area of Just War theory, Gratian's achievement was not in invention but in combining the writings of earlier theorists and providing them direction. Gratian made no distinction, however, between the legal and moral (or theological) in his categorization of warfare,[111] and the same writings of Church Fathers and Biblical examples of just wars he collected, many of which had been utilized by First Crusade narrative authors, were also drawn upon by those crafting battle orations in the period 1145–1187. Under this systematization the holy wars of the day, as well as of the past, became just wars. This accounts for the shift in battle rhetoric from the First Crusade, where references to the just cause of the conflict are few, to an increased presence of such notions as the twelfth century continued. The continuation of influences upon understandings of just war are numerous, and so one pertinent example will suffice. Chapters Two and Three discussed how Anselm of Lucca's formulation of holy war relied in particular upon the anti-Donatist writings of Augustine in order to argue that righteous wars could be fought with benevolent intent to punish sinner and criminals, not only for the sake of justice but also out of love and charity.[112] This understanding is echoed by Bishop Peter's oration, where he cites Augustine against Donatus directly: 'Hear what Augustine has said on this subject to Donatus the priest: 'An evil will must not be allowed its liberty, even as Paul, who persecuted the church of God, was not permitted to carry out his worst intentions.''[113]

109 The dating of Gratian's *Concordia Discordantium Canonum*, usually the Decretum, is the subject of ongoing debate, with suggestions ranging from early 'recensions' or stages prior to the 1140 version as early as the 1120 s, down to 1158. Anders Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's Decretum* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 136–46. Ken Pennington, 'The Biography of Gratian, the Father of Canon Law', *Villanova Law Review*, 59 (2014), 679–706.

110 Russell, *Just War*, p. 55.

111 James Brundage, 'The Hierarchy of Violence in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Canonists', *The International History Review* 17, 4 (1995), p. 676.

112 Riley-Smith, 'Crusading as an Act of Love', p. 188.

113 DEL, pp. 80–1.

That Gratian's *Decretum* drew upon myriad earlier works, means that identifying what writings on just war certain authors may have encountered in the twelfth century is a fraught task. However, it is certainly not the case that such theories had no real impact upon battle rhetoric in this period, as Bliese suggests;[114] and while direct influence is sometimes difficult to establish, it is hard to dispute the increase and development of rhetorical appeals to notions of just and righteous warfare in the battle rhetoric of this period.

Gratian synthesized Augustine's injunction that just wars avenged injuries with tenets of Isidore of Seville that centered on authoritative edict. While Augustine explored just war in the case of a failure of authority and defined a just war as one that had a just cause- usually recovering lost goods, or the repulsion of an enemy attack- Gratian's hybrid was thus: 'A just war is waged by an authoritative edict to avenge injury.'[115] Gratian in this way established, in the tradition of Isidore, the requirement of authority and a just cause in order for a war to be just. However, the issue of defining a just war took second place in Gratian's *Causa* 23. In *quaestio* 1, Gratian sought to reconcile the enactment of violence as part of military service with the teachings of Christ to turn the other cheek.[116] It is in this way that Gratian returned to an Augustinian foundation, concerned chiefly with sin. Asserting that the purpose of military service was to repel injuries and punish sins, Gratian drew upon Scripture and the writings of Origen and Augustine to conclude that there was no sin in military service, and that wars waged with benevolence could help separate sin from sinner. This explanation, along with a dictum on the priority of the soul over the body, necessitated good (inward) intentions on the part of soldiers. The notion was exemplified by John the Baptist's advice for soldiers to do no harm to the innocent, to be content with their wages, and to not employ violent force to extort money.[117]

As has been established, displaying the right intention of the crusaders through the motivational appeals of its climatic battle oration, as well as the broader narrative, was a clear priority for the author of *Lyxbonensi*. The sermon of the Bishop of Oporto stresses the need for the crusaders to 'put away the evil of your doings' and cast out envy entirely lest it weigh on the disposition (*habitus*) of their minds.[118] He warns them against vice at great length, and even recommends they eat modestly, claiming 'vice often steals in under the guise of virtue.'[119] Similarly Raol's oration presents one of the

114 Bliese, 'Just War as Concept and Motive', pp. 1–14.

115 Cum ergo istum bellum sit, quod ex edicto geritur, vel quod iniuriae ulcisscuntur. Russell, *Just War*, pp. 62–4.

116 Matthew 5:29.

117 Russell, *Just War*, pp. 57–8.

118 Auferte malum cogitationum. 2 Corinthians 9:10. DEL, pp. 72–5.

119 DEL, pp. 74–7.

longest and most developed rhetorical appeals to good intentions, associating the correct mindset with wisdom, discipline and God's love:

> 'Wisdom will not enter into a soul that deviseth evil,' put away malice from among you, for to do evil is nothing but to depart from discipline. Brothers, as the apostle teaches, seek that wisdom which is above, not which is on the earth. But only the pure in heart are able to attain it. And in order that you may fix the attention of the mind upon the contemplation of the highest wisdom, which, being immutable is certainly not the understanding, it is necessary that the understanding, which is mutable, contemplates itself and that it in a certain manner enter into the mind, in order that it may recognize itself to be not what God is, but nevertheless something which, after God, is able to give satisfaction.[120]

Raol goes on to warn against the desire to imitate God, which will open the crusaders up to pride and sin.[121] Here, then, can be seen a point of continuity between the battle rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi* and that of First Crusade narratives, which likewise stressed the important of right intention and avoiding sin, in order to ultimately ensure divine favour and victory. Nevertheless, the length and detail of these appeals, while a clear departure from First Crusade examples, is not without more contemporary parallels. For example, in an oration supposedly delivered on a campaign against rebellious Milan, Emperor Frederick Barbarossa assured his soldiers:

> Let no one suppose we wage wars at our whim; wars whose outcome is doubtful and whose consequences – famine, thirst, loss of sleep, and at last death in many a form- we know to be terrible and fearful. It is not a lust for domination that drives us to battle but a fierce rebellion … You will thus engage in warfare, not from greed or cruelty, but eager for peace, that the insolence of the wicked may be restrained, and that the good may be fittingly rewarded.[122]

Just as *Lyxbonensi* associates righteous intention with discipline, an issue which the so-called Dartmouth Rules were intended to combat,[123] so too does this oration follow shortly after Frederick issues extensive edicts of behaviour for his own army.[124] Towards the conclusion of Walter Espec's

120 DEL, pp. 148–9.
121 DEL, pp. 150–1.
122 Waitz, *Ottonis et Rahewini* pp. 202–3. Charles Christopher Mierow (ed.), *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa by Otto of Freising and his continuator, Rahewin* (New York, 1966), p. 205.
123 Throop, 'Christian Community and the Crusades', p. 112.
124 Waitz, *Ottonis et Rahewini*, pp. 199–202.

oration, Aelred contrasts the personal righteousness of the Anglo-Normans fighting at the Standard with the savage Scottish soldiers, whose behaviour is described in excessively gruesome detail, no doubt to reinforce the point Aelred sought to make.[125] While other orations this chapter has explored employ appeals to martial prowess, national or racial reputation, or appeals to material reward in order to reinforce the importance of right intention, extended direct statements of such are more infrequent, and are usually found in cases where justification was a greater concern, but also where the influence of canon law is easier to detect. Moreover, while right intention is demonstrably a concern for a great deal of First Crusade battle rhetoric, orations penned between 1145–1187 display a greater concern for other elements of just war theory, usually absent from First Crusade examples. For instance, Gratian's formulation of just war rested on a robust understanding of authority, and while it is certainly not the case that First Crusade narrative authors conceived of the expedition as one which lacked authoritative edict, their battle rhetoric certainly never made reference to the conflict as sanctioned in any fashion other than by the will of the divine.

This is in contrast to a number of orations that appeal, sometimes in great detail, to the ecclesiastical or secular authorities behind a particular conflict.[126] First, as well as stressing right intention, Frederick's speech on his campaign against Milan begins with an appeal to authority that blends both the civil and spiritual:

> We acknowledge that we owe great, inexpressibly great, thanks to the King of Kings, by whose will we govern the kingdom as His servants and yours. He has bestowed upon us such great confidence in your probity and prudence, which has been so often demonstrated, that, with your support and counsel, we can confidently face whatever may happen, anything that may threaten the security of the Roman Empire. The Roman Empire, we say, whose servant we recognize ourselves to be, and whose authority lies with you who are the princes of the realm.[127]

While Raol's pre-battle speech does not reference authority (other than divine authority), it is expressed in a longer passage on the just warfare the Bishop of Oporto wished to convince the crusaders to undertake:

125 RS, p. 189. Dutton, *Historical Works*, p. 257.

126 Cf. Bliese argues that public authority is only found in Frederick's speech during the Milanese rebellion; however, in the period in which this oration was recorded, and given the likely influence of Gratian's work, distinguishing between public authority and ecclesiastical authority is problematic. Bliese, 'Just War as Concept and Motive', pp. 4–5.

127 Waitz, *Ottonis et Rahewini*, p. 202. Mierow, *Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 205.

> Brothers, you have laid aside the arms [of violence] by which the property of others is laid waste- concerning which it is said, 'He that strikes with the sword shall perish with the sword,' that is, he who, without the command or consent of any higher or legitimate power, takes up arms against the life of his brothers …[128]

In Aelred's *Relatio*, Walter Espec claims that the Anglo-Norman cause is just because they are fighting for their rightful ruler Stephen, 'he whom the people sought, the clergy chose, the pope anointed, and apostolic authority confirmed in his kingdom.' The role which ought to have been played by churchmen of all stations from popes to simple clergy in the declaration and prosecution of wars was of great concern to Gratian and the Decretists, who naturally sought to limit their involvement. However, there was no clear consensus on clerical fighting. Yet authority, being central to their thinking, ensured support for the notion that the papacy and even bishops were able to declare war.[129] The *Gesta Alberonis* provides an excellent example of a churchman utilizing his authority to prosecute violence. Moreover, while clerics were unable to bear arms, Gratian added his own opinion to older edicts on the Church's ability to exercise religious persecution, explaining that a legitimate clerical function in wartime was the exhortation (*hortari*) of others to defend those facing oppression and to make war on the enemies of God.[130] In justifying Church sanctioned violence against heretics and other enemies, Gratian drew upon Leo IV's exhortation to the Frankish army, promising them the Kingdom of Heaven should they perish fighting.[131] While the majority of First Crusade battle rhetoric was described as being delivered by lay noblemen, and the laity remain well represented by battle rhetoric, there is a perceptible shift in the kinds of appeals employed in speeches by either clergy or laity, notably in the case of salvation, discussed later. These examples illustrate that, while previously considered marginal, authority, particularly church authority, was clearly a consideration of a number of oration authors. However, even wars waged with ecclesiastical involvement and authority required a just cause. As with appeals to righteous intention, many orations from this period develop references to the just cause being fought for in a far more extensive fashion than examples form First Crusade narratives.

The variance in what was understood to be a just cause, not only by canonists but also by modern scholarship, makes forming a coherent picture across multiple sources difficult. However, indisputable are the conditions found in Gratian's *Causa* 23 *quaestio* 2, ultimately drawn from Isidore of

128 DEL, pp. 78–81.
129 Russell, *Just War*, pp. 108, 116–8.
130 Russell, *Just War*, p. 78.
131 Russell, *Just War*, p. 75.

Seville, that just war recovered lost goods or repelled an enemy attack.[132] Crucially, where these appeals are the most extensive or of high significance to the orations they are found within, they are often made in canonist language. Both Raol and Peter Pitões categorize the Muslims of Lisbon as criminals, with the latter drawing upon both Isidore and Scripture:

> Engage in a just war with the zeal of righteousness, not with the bile of wrath. 'For a war is just, which is waged after a declaration, to recover property or to repulse enemies'; and, since it is just to punish murderers and sacrilegious men and poisoners, the shedding of their blood is not murder. Likewise he is not cruel who slays the cruel. And he who puts to death wicked men is a servant of the Lord, for the reason that they are wicked and there is ground for killing them. Certainly the children of Israel waged a just war against the Amorites when they refused a peaceful passage [through their borders].[133]

Shortly before this instance, the bishop assures his audience that prosecuting the conflict he proposes is defensive in nature and that the law makes clear that anything done in self-defence is lawful.[134] Similarly, the criminality of the enemies of Emperor Frederick is expressed in his speech concerning the Milanese rebels who have, in rising up, contravened the established law and the authority.[135] This and a number of other features of Frederick's oration have been identified as drawing on precepts from Gratian's *Causa* 23, which has also been recognized as influencing the *Gesta Alberonis*.[136] The *Gesta's* single oration is dominated by the notion of just cause, specifically relating to a broken oath of fidelity on the part of Count Palatine Herman and the need for this transgression to be put right.[137]

The crimes of their enemies and the defence of the *patria* are also treated extensively in Walter Espec's speech at the Standard. It is in fact because of the extent of the Scottish atrocities that Walter tells his men that 'need presses us.' His charge to fight for home and family is particularly striking as it seems to take precedence over the aforementioned authority he invokes. While Walter can apparently foresee that some will contest the justice of their cause on the basis of their support for King Stephen, despite the approval of the papacy, his presentation of their cause goes beyond this: 'To be silent concerning the king for a moment, no one will surely deny that we are right to take up arms for our country, that we fight for our wives, for our

132 Russell, *Just War*, p. 62.

133 DEL, pp. 80–1.

134 DEL, pp. 78–9.

135 Waitz, *Ottonis et Rahewini,* p. 202.

136 Brian A. Pavlac (trans.) *A Warrior Bishop of the Twelfth Century: The Deeds of Albero of Trier, by Balderich* (Toronto, 2008), pp. 33–5.

137 GA, p. 256.

children and for our churches, warding off an impending danger.'[138] That Aelred presents the right to take up arms was in a way more widely recognized than the sanction of authority perhaps indicates a familiarity with Gratian's formulation of Isidore, or perhaps earlier authors who drew from him, such as Ivo of Chartres. This, however, can only be the subject of speculation, although a copy of Gratian's *Decretum* has been identified at Rievaulx towards the end of the twelfth century.[139]

In comparison with the earlier examples the battle rhetoric of authors such as Lisiard, Helmold of Bosau and William of Tyre employ appeals to the crimes of the enemy or the defence of the *patria* less frequently and are far less extensive in their treatment of these ideas through direct speech. For example, in Helmold's *Chronica* an oration, made by Count Adolf II of Holstein supposedly concluded with a brief plea that, because their fatherland was threatened, it was demanded that they take up arms in its defence.[140] Moreover, Henry of Huntingdon's account of the Standard contains no actual appeal to the defence of the homeland, and only a formulaic account of the sacrilegious crimes of the enemy.[141]

An exception to the difference of just cause appeals between those which have or may have strong canonist influences and where canonist ideas are less discernible is the notion of vengeance, which is often an important aspect of battle orations in this period, even when other appeals to a particular 'just cause' or authority are not present. In *Lyxbonensi* it is notable that, while vengeance is certainly part of the broader rhetoric of the text, it does not enter into Raol's oration at all, even during an extended section on the mockery of the incarnation by the crusaders' opponents. Indeed, while the harangue makes reference to the crimes of the enemy, far more attention is given to the behaviour and reform of the Christian soldiery. In contrast Bishop Peter's sermon discusses vengeance at length. The devastation wrought by the Moors and Moabites across Spain is described as divine vengeance (*divina ultio*),[142] before the bishop urges vengeance against those responsible. In a fashion similar to the final battle speech of Baldric of Bourgueil, this extended appeal to vengeance reinforces its point through use of familial language:

> To you the mother church, as it were with her arms cut off and her face disfigured, appeals for help; she asks for help; she seeks vengeance at your hands for the blood of her sons. She calls to you, verily, she cries

138 RS, p. 187. Dutton, *Historical Works*, p. 254.
139 Z19.2 in Rievaulx's first catalogue. http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/Z19/ [accessed 11/10/18].
140 HB, p. 127.
141 HH, p. 716.
142 DEL, p. 76.

> aloud. 'Execute vengeance upon the heathen and punishments upon the people.' … Verily, it is through good work that anyone deserves to come to a glorious end. Therefore, as worthy rivals [strive together] to raise up the fallen and prostrate church of Spain; reclothe her soiled and disfigured form with the garments of joy and gladness. As worthy sons, look not on the shame of a father nor say to a mother 'It is a gift by whatsoever thou mightiest be profited by me.' Weigh not lightly your duty to your fellow men; for, as St. Ambrose says, 'He who does not ward off an injury from his comrades and brothers, if he can, is as much at fault as he who does the injury'.[143]

The familial emphasis of this rhetoric has been understood within the same context as such appeals in First Crusade narratives, reflecting an understanding of vengeance as being part of the social obligations owed to particular groups, usually kin groups.[144] It is worthy of note that it is regarding vengeance that *Lyxbonensi* makes the most extensive use of the language of family relationships, rather than in maintaining or extending the achievements of forefathers, a notion central to *Quantum praedecessores*, wherein ideas of vengeance are notably absent.[145] Moreover, personal vengeance, or vengeance for the 'psychological benefit' of the avenger, is nowhere present.[146] Perhaps sensitive to such accusations, the bishop reassures the crusaders:

> Indeed, such works of vengeance are duties which righteous men perform with a good conscience. Brothers, be not afraid. For in acts of this sort you will not be censured for murder or taxed with any crime; on the contrary you will be adjudged answerable if you should abandon your enterprise. 'Indeed, there is no cruelty where piety towards God is concerned.' Engage in a just war with the zeal of righteousness, not with the bile of wrath.[147]

In *Lyxbonensi*, as in First Crusade accounts, vengeance is taken on behalf of Christian 'brothers' and 'sisters' for the 'mother' Church or for God the father. Rather than being at odds with the writing of theologians and canonists, *Lyxbonensi* drew upon them to construct its battle rhetoric, even citing the same scriptural passage, used by Gratian to justify authorized punishment by the papacy of a 'universal injury', in the bishop's sermon.[148]

143 DEL, pp. 78–9.
144 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, p. 108.
145 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 84–5.
146 Cf. Bliese, 'Just War as Concept and Motive', p. 11.
147 DEL, pp. 80–1.
148 Deuteronomy 13:6. DEL, p. 82. Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, p. 92.

However, as Bliese noted, the terms often used to discuss injury and vengeance, specifically *iniuria*, *ultio* and *vindicta* were ambiguous, yet this was far from unapparent to canonists. In *quaestio* 1 and 2 of *Causa* 23 Gratian wrestled with the problem of unrestrained violence entering his construction of just war. He forbade personal vengeance, insisted that a man who took his own vengeance could not become a priest (although clergymen could exhort laymen to take just vengeance)[149] and followed Augustine in emphasizing the need for legitimate authority.[150] It is, moreover, difficult to detect any sense of personal vengeance, as opposed to punishment directed by legitimate authority, human or divine, in the Latin battle rhetoric of this period. That such appeals actually reveal underlying hatred of 'the enemy' by those being addressed[151] is also difficult to discern from any other contemporary orations.

In Aelred's *Relatio*, vengeance is another tool employed to provide a contrast between the cause of the Anglo-Normans and that of the Scots. After Walter Espec claims that his men are fighting beasts, rather than other men, he instructed them to: 'Consecrate your hands in the blood of sinners: happy are they whose hands Christ has chosen to avenge his injuries today.' Vengeance will also be enacted by Michael and the angels for the churches the Scots have desecrated.[152] Conversely, Robert de Bruce scolds David because his invasion provided Scottish soldiers with a chance to pursue their own personal revenge against those who have previously been David's allies.[153] While vengeance does not feature in Henry of Huntingdon's account of the Standard, it is an important part of Robert of Gloucester's oration before the Battle of Lincoln (1141). While the form of this appeal to *uindicta* is earthlier in focus, with Robert claiming it is those whom Stephen has disinherited who have the right to make the first attack, Robert is depicted as deliberately forgoing his opportunity for personal vengeance. Moreover, it is the just judge God who will ultimately deliver the punishment.[154]

Even where religious reference is absent, vengeance is still presented in terms of justice and authority. At the climax of Frederick's speech on the campaign against Milan, the emperor tells his men that not avenging injuries would be shameful:

> But if through sloth or cowardice we did not reply with avenging sword to the insult inflicted upon us by Milan, we would now undoubtedly be bearing it in vain, and our patience in this matter would not so much be

149 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 33–4.
150 Bliese, 'Just War as Concept and Motive', p. 11. Russell, *Just War*, pp. 67–8.
151 Bliese, 'Just War as Concept and Motive', p. 11–12.
152 RS, p. 188. Dutton, *Historical Works*, p. 256.
153 RS, p. 192–4
154 HH, pp. 726–7.

deserving of praise as our negligence worthy of execration. It is therefore in the name of justice that we justly claim your support, that the defiance of our adversaries may fail of effect and that the repute of the empire that has endured to our own times may be maintained under our rule. We are not inflicting injury, but are removing it.[155]

The care taken by Rahewin to ensure the vengeance the emperor was seeking was in keeping with justice and authority, in a fashion similar to many of the earlier examples, points towards a greater sense of caution concerning such notions compared to orations from the early twelfth century, despite the continued deployment of these appeals in this period. A comparison of the two instances in which Helmold includes vengeance in his battle rhetoric is likewise revealing. The oration of Gerlav the priest, addressed to a group of Frisians, concludes with a call for the defenders of Süssel to 'avenge their own blood'. Though they were eventually slaughtered, the appeal is ultimately vindicated; not only are the Frisians described as fighting more valiantly than the Maccabees, but their deeds result in retaliation which drives the Slavs from Christian lands.[156] Conversely the oration of Prince Pribislav concludes with an explicit call for personal vengeance,[157] but unlike the defiant last stand of Gerlav and his fellows, this speech precedes an unmitigated failure. The distinction is perhaps best understood within the context of vengeance being increasingly presented throughout the twelfth century as the responsibility of those in positions of power and perceived legitimate authority.[158] Susanna Throop has argued that this transition from vengeance as part of a social obligation to 'friends', be they family, fellow crusaders, fellow Christians, God or Christ, was supplemented by lordship.[159] This is reflected in an oration of William of Tyre, depicting the events of the First Crusade, wherein the crusaders are urged to take vengeance, not just for their 'brothers', as per an example earlier in the text, but for their 'lords and brethren'.[160]

While this explanation is to an extent convincing, it is nevertheless the case that when compared with First Crusade orations, the rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi*, as well as contemporary non-crusading examples, frequently employs extended appeals to vengeance that used the language of familial or social obligation, justice and reference to ecclesiastical authority, as opposed to lordship. Moreover, such examples highlight the lack of a clear distinction between 'secular' and 'ecclesiastical' notions of justice in Latin

155 Waitz, *Ottonis et Rahewini*, pp. 202–3. Mierow, *Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 205–6.
156 HB, p. 125. Tschan, *Chronicle of the Slavs*, pp. 179.
157 HB, pp. 196–7. Tschan, *Chronicle of the Slavs*, p. 256.
158 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 19–31, 109–111.
159 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 111–2.
160 WT, pp. 215–6, 276.

narratives, wherein the taking of vengeance could be legitimately called for by churchmen,[161] and presented as 'a Christian activity, [sic] at times almost a Christian virtue.'[162] This understanding is in line with much of the writing on just war by those following Gratian, who centrally conceived of such warfare as serving to punish injuries to both God and Christians, as well as to repel illicit violence.[163]

Divine Aid

In a manner similar to that of Adhemar of Le Puy, as recorded by Robert the Monk,[164] the pre-battle speech at Lisbon opens with an assurance that no one should be afraid, because 'everyone has a guardian angel assigned to him.'[165] Such references to divine or supernatural agents are one way in which otherwise formulaic appeals to divine aid could be developed by oration authors and serve to mark out the events being described as sacred history. In comparison, God is invoked at the conclusion of Frederick's speech before battle against the Milanese in a fashion which actually emphasizes human over heavenly agency:

> With God's gracious aid the hostile city will not find us slow or weak in preserving what was added to the empire by our predecessors Charles and Otto- the first emperors beyond the mountains (the former of the West, the latter of the East Franks) to extend the bounds of the empire.[166]

Such extended or detailed appeals to divine aid were not the preserve of crusading battle rhetoric, however. In Aelred's *Relatio*, as well as telling the Anglo-Normans that 'victory does not depend on numbers and is not acquired by strength, by righteous prayers and an honest cause let us obtain it from the Almighty', Walter soon after that claims there is no reason at all to fear defeat because 'victory has been given our people by the Most High as if it were our due.'[167] This form of the motivational appeal, in which victory in war is 'owned' or possessed,[168] is perhaps unique to the *Relatio*.[169] Moreover, at the climax of Walter's speech, Aelred includes a truly epic promise of divine aid:

161 Russell, *Just War*, p. 78.
162 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance,* p. 33.
163 Russell, *Just War*, p. 126.
164 RM, p. 74.
165 DEL, pp. 146–7.
166 Waitz, *Ottonis et Rahewini,* pp. 203–4. Mierow, *Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 206.
167 RS, p. 185. Dutton, *Historical Works*, p. 252.
168 quasi in feudum.
169 Bliese, 'Aelred of Rievaulx's Rhetoric', p. 553.

> Divine aid is with us; the whole heavenly court will be fighting with us. Michael will be there with the angels, ready to avenge the injury of him whose church they have defiled with human blood, whose altars they have desecrated by placing on it a human head. Peter with the apostles will fight for us, whose basilicas they turned first into stables and then into brothels. The holy martyrs will head our troops, whose memorials they have burned, whose halls they have filled with slaughter. The holy virgins- although they are reluctant to enter the fight- will fight for us by prayer. More than that I say that Christ himself will take up arms and shield and will rise to our aid.[170]

This appeal is unusual because of its length, being around as long as the entire Gallovidian speech later in the *Relatio*, as well as many complete orations in other narratives. In stark contrast, while Ralph's speech in Henry of Huntingdon includes the sentiment that the Anglo-Normans should trust in God more than their bravery, there is no heavenly aid on offer. This difference between the two speeches seems all the more remarkable because of the fact that the oration delivered by a layman includes a biblical reference to Psalm 35,[171] while Ralph's contains no biblical allusions, highlighting how these two examples challenge the rhetorical tradition of plausibility as understood by Bachrach.[172]

Aelred makes clear that the divine aid Walter promises at the Standard is assured to them because of their good intentions and their righteous cause. Raol's oration presents this same notion, making an extended call for both outward and inward reform, in order for the crusaders to 'respond in accordance with the character of this most holy guardianship.'[173] The need for reconciliation with God, as opposed to celebration that this state has been achieved, only features as prominently as Raol's rhetoric in one other cotemporary oration, that being the speech by King Alfred in Aelred's *Genealogia*,[174] whose focus on reconciliation and spiritual and moral reform in the context of English politics in the early second half of the twelfth century requires little explanation. However, even this example does not deal with the issue of righteous intention and behaviour as well as repentance and moral reform in the same detail as Raol's oration. Following his introduction, and a passage on righteousness and truth, the priest continues in the vein of repentance and reform:

> And, if you have deviated from the guidance of your angel, take care to be reconciled with the Lord through penance; and, through obedience to

170 RS, pp. 188–189. Dutton, *Historical Works*, pp. 256–7.
171 RS, p. 189.
172 Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility', pp. 1–19.
173 DEL, pp. 146–7.
174 GRA, p. 721.

> the commands of God, try to return to the place from which though disobedience you have fallen. But perhaps you will say, 'Wherein have we contemned the commands of God?' Hear what the prophet Malachi has said about you: 'In that ye have brought to the altar polluted bread and stolen food and that ye have made as your votive offerings to God, the king of all, things such that, if ye had offered them to your princes, they would surely not have received them.' And in all these things you have angered God rather than appeased him. It is folly and perfect nonsense for a man to think of deceiving God in any manner. 'For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.'[175]

The themes of proper behaviour and intention, as well as moral reform and repentance are, throughout *Lyxbonensi*, associated with the understanding of the expedition, even in its diversion, as a pilgrimage. This is made explicit in Hervey of Glanville's address, wherein he insists that the Anglo-Normans reform their morals, and calls for the forgiveness of past wrongs, for the sake of the love and charity which ought to underscore the pilgrimage.[176] Another appeal to divine aid found in Raol's oration also serves to reinforce the devotional and penitential themes of the narrative. Supposedly raising a relic of the True Cross, the priest exclaimed: 'Behold, brothers, behold the wood of the cross of the Lord. Bend your knees and lie prone upon the ground. Strike your guilty breasts, while you await the aid of the Lord. For it will come, it will come.'[177]

This appeal serves not only as a reassurance of heavenly assistance but, in emphasizing God's power before the comparative impotence of the crusaders, the relic has been argued to stress the virtue of humility, which Raol's oration places as central to righteousness in the eyes of God.[178] The sermon goes on to reference Sirach in explaining that pride is the beginning of sin, and while the Devil is an example for the proud, Christ is an example for the humble.[179] It is Christ who has 'offered himself for the imitation of his humility', who provides the remedy, or medicine, for pride. That this is done through the Incarnation serves to address the Muslim mockery of that belief which *Lyxbonensi* describes as taking place earlier in the siege.[180]

In language reminiscent of authors such as Guibert of Nogent,[181] the worthiness demanded to ensure divine assistance is the moral reform implied

175 DEL, pp. 148–9.
176 DEL, p. 106.
177 DEL, pp. 154–5.
178 Throop, 'Christian Community and the Crusades', p. 107
179 DEL, p. 150. Ecclesiastes 10:15.
180 ei se Dominus ad humilitatis imitationem preberet. DEL, p. 152.
181 Phillips, 'Crusade and Holy War', pp. 128–9.

by the references to baptism found in the sermon of Bishop Peter and that of Raol,[182] as well as the declaration that the crusaders had left their homes to follow Christ:

> And you, most dearly beloved brethren, who have followed Christ as voluntary exiles and have willingly accepted poverty, hear and understand that the prize is promised to those who start but is given to those who persevere. Yet he cannot persevere who still loiters at the beginning of a worthy enterprise in ignorance and neglect. Let the ignorant, if through repentance he comes to his senses and recognizes his fault, pray with tears and groans …[183]

Bishop Peter likewise praises the crusaders for having left their homes and families in order to follow Christ. These invocations of the spiritual ideal of *imitatio Christi* demonstrates forcefully how, in some sense, *Lyxbonensi* drew upon older notions of crusading, which were to be found among other places in early twelfth century narratives. These ideas were deployed, seemingly, as an alternative the more contemporary preaching instituted by the papacy and conducted largely by Bernard of Clairvaux and his Cistercians who, as Purkis has demonstrated, sought to actively diminish the association between this ideal and the practice of crusading.[184]

While First Crusade battle rhetoric was involved in the wider explanatory framework, which understood good intentions as essential to securing divine aid, the battle rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi* goes far beyond both early and later twelfth century crusading and non-crusading comparative orations, in terms of length and detail, in its formulation of divine aid being underpinned by repentance and moral reform. This certainly reflects the text's central concern of justifying the Lisbon expedition and presenting it as an endeavour which was undertaken by repentant Christians who were guided to victory under divine direction.

Unity

The representation of the Lisbon campaign as an essentially devotional endeavour, a pilgrimage which ought to have been performed for love and charity, is also foundational to another prominent theme of its battle rhetoric, the theme of unity.[185] Beyond Hervey's oration, love is presented in Raol's pre-battle speech as essential to true reconciliation with God: 'For he strives beyond that which the command of God requires, in that he loves his

182 DEL, p. 72, 154.
183 DEL, pp. 152–3.
184 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, pp. 80–5.
185 Bull, *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative*, p. 113.

neighbours not as himself, but more than himself.'[186] While the love of neighbours, in the sense of the social obligation of *caritas* to 'friends', had a place in the battle rhetoric of First Crusade narratives, Riley-Smith argued that this was the extent of the ideal, which was unable to embrace the love of one's enemies in an Augustinian sense.[187] While *Lyxbonensi* perhaps goes further than any other contemporary crusade account in expressing a sense of love for the enemy, there is no such rhetoric in Raol's pre-battle speech, although, as has been noted earlier, Raol in no real way expressed hatred in his battle rhetoric. The solution to Islamic mockery in *Lyxbonensi* is not hatred, but Christ-like humility. Raol's appeal to love is thus in line with how love is centrally represented across *Lyxbonensi*, as a unifying force. In the speech by the Bishop of Oporto, he describes love as being essential to the crusaders' endeavour and it is explicitly tied to warding off the vices that can sow discord:

> The welfare of your associates is yours in any case: love it in others, even though you cannot imitate it, and it will become your own, even as when loved in colleagues. Therefore, put away envy which casts out love and nourishes discord, which corrupts and wastes the body and prevents it from enjoying its proper health and vigour. For while the plague of envy tortures the mind, it consumes the body and destroys whatever good appears to be in it … Accordingly, there is no love except between the good, for love is without strength unless there is affection on each side. The guardian of love or affection is innocence, which is believed to be endowed with such virtue and grace in order to be pleasing to both God and men. That is true innocence which harms neither itself nor another, and when it is strong it is content to be useful.[188]

In this passage, love and charity are associated with unity and discipline. Discipline is described early on in that same speech as a privilege provided by God, and Raol also directly equates a lack of discipline with moral and spiritual evil.[189] It has been argued that unity in *Lyxbonensi* has two distinct forms, practical and spiritual; however, there is a sense in which this dichotomy is a false one. Phillips has argued that Hervey's speech combines spiritual and practical unity,[190] and while he suggested that the practical element of unity was exemplified in the sworn association of the crusaders, Throop has argued forcefully for the spiritual relevance of this oath and the 'Dartmouth Rules', arguing for their equivalency with, or even pre-eminence

186 DEL, pp. 158–9.
187 Riley Smith, *First Crusade and the Idea*, p. 27.
188 DEL, pp. 74–7.
189 DEL, p. 70, 148.
190 DEL, pp. 104–7. Phillips, 'Crusading and Holy War', p. 134.

over, the crusading vow.[191] Moreover, Throop has argued that the religious and social practices outlined in *Lyxbonensi* mapped a pattern which was distinct from the idiosyncratic and 'ad hoc' religious practices of a typical military campaign, constructing the expedition as a penitential *conversatio morum*, a true 'monastery on the move.'[192] The Dartmouth Rules have also been argued to reflect ideals and practices of reform monasticism, in the separation of men and women, the regulation against costly garments and the establishing of common wealth. According to Throop, these practices combine to indicate a level of spirituality which goes beyond comparable notions found in First Crusade narratives, instituting a 'regular' life, undertaken following a *conversio* in the face of hardship, specifically the perilous ocean journey.[193] In this way, crusading is presented as another form of religious life, one of many which proliferated or intensified during the period of 1100–1300. This diversification, which was met with considerable, although not entirely unreserved, acceptance, was conversely unified by a common desire to imitate Christ and the community of the apostolic early church.[194] As was explored in Chapters Two and Three, a number of elements found throughout First Crusade battle rhetoric, including particular terms such as *unanimis* and *concors*, reflected the importance of the *vita apostolica* and *ecclesia primitiva* to crusading spirituality in the early twelfth century. Unity in *Lyxbonensi* is often expressed in the same language. While Raol's oration does not employ the terms *unanimis* and *concoers*, his speech nevertheless treats in detail the subjects of discipline (not explicitly of a military nature), love and unity, associating them with evangelical preaching:

> May the God of peace and love … who giveth his word with mighty power to those who proclaim the gospel unto the perfection of his preaching and the display of his works- holding us by the hand, may he direct us in accordance with his will and receive us with glory; may he so control us who lead that we may rule over his flock with discipline.[195]

Bishop Peter's speech on the other hand does employ familiar terminology, at the opening of his oration claiming: 'And truly fortunate is your country

191 Throop, 'Christian Communities', p. 103, 120.

192 David S. Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 108–50. Throop, 'Christian Communities', p. 114. Riley-Smith, *First Crusade and Idea*, p. 150.

193 Throop, 'Christian Communities', p. 112.

194 Giles Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 47–9. William J. Purkis, 'Religious Symbols and Practices: Monastic Spirituality, Pilgrimage and Crusade', *in European Religious Cultures: Essays offered to Christopher Brooke on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*, ed. by Miri Rubin (London, 2008), p. 70.

195 DEL, pp. 158–9.

which rears such sons, and in such numbers, and unites them in such a unanimous association.'[196] Moreover, his speech celebrates that:

> … with the zeal of the law of God in their hearts, led by the impulse of the [Holy] Spirit, they have left all and come hither to us, the sons of the primitive church, through so many perils of lands and seas and bearing the expenses of a long journey.[197]

In spite of the language employed here, which described the crusaders as *primitive ecclesie filiis*, Purkis has been hesitant to see the *vita apostolica* in *Lyxbonensi*. He highlights specifically the reference to Ambrose, over an apostolic figure, in Bishop Peter's explanation of the Christian duty to help other Christians.[198] However, in Raol's pre-battle speech the ideal to love one's neighbour more than oneself is compared with the continual heavenly advocacy of St. Paul.[199]

While invoking a sense of collective cooperation seems an obvious rhetorical device in the circumstances of reassuring soldiers before battle, the seamless blend of the social and spiritual facets of unity found in *Lyxbonensi*, and earlier crusading rhetoric, is far from universal. Otto of Freising's oration by Frederick I draws upon Virgil in order to appeal to a seemingly secular sense of camaraderie.[200] Similarly, an oration Helmold attributes to Henry, son of the Obotrite prince Gottschalk, places tremendous emphasis on the loyalty of Henry's soldiery, but this is done without religious reference.[201]

Even when an oration centres on religious themes, no other text includes the same amalgamation of spiritual unity, military discipline and moral reform. The theme of unity is even reinforced by the selective use of the crusaders' 'collective perception' at moments when faithful devotion overcomes a potential source of discord.[202] Accounting for the particularity of the text in this regard is in part speculative. It is certainly not the case that the stress on devotion, or moral reform, was unique to the battle rhetoric of the *Lyxbonensi*, yet its treatment of these ideas nevertheless stands apart. That the battle rhetoric of First Crusade narratives constructed crusaders as suitable *exempla* of righteous warriors, fulfilling their profession in line with the divine will, has been discussed in earlier chapters. However, the issue of how lay soldiers would encounter these ideas remains a challenging one. In this regard, Throop has emphasised the epistolary form of *Lyxbonensi* as

196 DEL, pp. 70–1.
197 DEL, pp. 72–3.
198 Purkis, *Crusader Spirituality*, pp. 82–3.
199 DEL, pp. 158–9.
200 Waitz, *Ottonis et Rahewini*, p. 148.
201 HB, pp. 79–80.
202 Bull, *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative*, pp. 155–56.

evidence for its intended dissemination amongst the community surrounding its recipient, arguing for an association between the war camp and the parish, and the values applicable to both.[203] That the rhetorical tradition of plausibility demanded such invented speeches be appropriate to their circumstances as conforming to a considerable standard of verisimilitude reinforces this notion. Through battle rhetoric, *Lyxbonensi* constructs crusading warfare as not centrally concerned with martial virtue or the imitation of heroic ancestors, but as an exercise in the virtues of unity, discipline, charity and humility. These virtues are presented as far more important to overcoming the sin of both the crusaders and their enemies. In this regard it is noteworthy that ultimately crusaders were implored, explicitly through battle rhetoric, to take the virtues of the 'home front' to the battlefield, not the other way around.

The Cross, Suffering and Salvation

Throughout *Lyxbonensi*, the crusaders are continually associated with the cross, being described by Bishop Peter as *filii Christi et servi crucis*, and a 'mystery of the cross'. The bishop supposedly also claimed:

> Oh how great is the joy of all those who present a more cheerful face to hardships and pain than we do, we who, alas, are vegetating here in slothful idleness. 'Verily, this is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in his eyes.' Verily, dear brothers, you have gone forth without the camp bearing the reproach of the cross …'[204]

The image of the cross was central to the representation of the crusade as a penitential pilgrimage, undertaken in imitation of Christ. Elsewhere the cross manifests itself in support of the text's main themes, for example Hervey of Glanville employs the imagery of diverse peoples being all together signed with the sign of the cross as part of his call for unity.[205] Although Raol's oration uses the word *vexillum* to describe the cross, it is ultimately presented as a sign of salvation. After being told to kneel or prostrate themselves before the cross, Raol continues:

> You shall perceive the help of the Lord above you. Adore Christ, the Lord, who on this wood of the saving cross spread out his hands and feet for your salvation and glory. Under this ensign, if only you falter not, you shall conquer. Because if it should happen that anyone signed

203 Throop, 'Christian Communities', pp. 123–5.

204 DEL, pp. 70–1. The final Pauline phrase, derived from Hebrews 13:13 was also employed by Guibert of Nogent. GN, p. 332.

205 DEL, p. 104.

with this cross should die, we do not believe that life has been taken from him, for we have no doubt that he is changed into something better. Here, therefore, to live is glory and to die is gain.[206]

The conclusion of this appeal to the cross, as well as drawing upon the words of Philippians 1:21, echoes the writing of Bernard of Clairvaux in his description of crusading as 'a cause in which to conquer is glorious and for which to die is gain.'[207] Moreover, a letter of Peter the Venerable to Louis VII in support of the proposed expedition to the East bears a strong resemblance to Raol's exhortation and Bishop Peter's sermon: 'For what honours, what riches, what pleasures, what home or parents can hold them back? And yet, leaving everything, they have chosen to follow their Christ, to toil for him, to fight for him, to die for him and to live for him.'[208]

These instances express a prominent theme of First Crusade narratives, that being the willingness to suffer the hardships of campaigning for spiritual reward, even unto death either on or off the battlefield, as a form of martyrdom in imitation of Christ.[209] This penitential and salvific aspect of the crusading cross is by far its most significant attribute in the rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi*. While still an emblem of victory, Raol makes no reference to the cross in the talismanic sense in which it is found in some First Crusade orations.

The absence of the individual protective aspect of the cross is difficult to account for, although it could perhaps indicate a transference of the talismanic quality of the cross as crusader badge to the True Cross.[210] It is notable that, where the cross is evoked in the battle rhetoric of this period, both within and without a crusading context, it is often in reference to a relic of the True Cross. Just as Raol urges the crusaders to 'behold the wood of the cross of the Lord', William of Tyre describes an oration in which the patriarch of Jerusalem encourages the soldiers of Baldwin I 'bringing with him the life-giving cross.'[211] Similarly, in the climactic exhortation of the *Gesta Alberonis*, Albero's archiepiscopal cross was central to the vow which Count Herman had broken:

206 DEL, pp. 154–7.

207 Bernard of Clairvaux, '*Epistolae*', in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, eds J. Leclercq, H. Rochais and C.H. Talbot, 8 vols (Rome, 1955–77), viii, p. 315.

208 Giles Constable (ed.), *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA, 1967), i, p. 328.

209 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, pp. 80–1.

210 On the relic in the Kingdom of Jerusalem before 1187 see Alan V. Murray, "Mighty Against the Enemies of Christ': The Relic of the True Cross in the Armies of the Kingdom of Jerusalem", in *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton, ed. by John France and William G. Zajac* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 217–38.

211 WT, p. 498.

> This is the cross upon which Herman, Count Palatine, swore fidelity to me on that day when I made him advocate of our Church, on that day when I conferred on him those powers and that authority by which he now attacks me. I told him then that in this cross is a piece of the Lord's cross, upon which He, whose sacrosanct image shines here, triumphed over the enemy of the human race; and I pointed out that the relics of many other venerable saints were contained in this cross.[212]

Herman is then quoted in his oath, wherein he named Christ as his guarantor, thus meriting the physical force brought against him in retribution. Indeed, it is the soldiers of Albero, *fideles Ihesu Christi*, who come to the defence of his church. However, it is crucial to note that this meritorious action did not serve to justify the forthcoming violence on a personal level. Albero tells his soldiers to prepare their hearts for God (*preparate corda vestra Domino*), before outlining their merited spiritual reward:

> And because there is no time for you to make individual confessions, make to me, your pastor, a general confession of your sins; and by the power given to me by God through my office, I shall make indulgence and remission for you of all your sins so that if today anyone should be called from this temporal and uncertain life, he may cross over to a better one, namely eternal life.[213]

In regard to promises of salvation and heavenly reward in battle rhetoric, this example stands in contrast to *Lyxbonensi*, where such appeals are formulated independently of the requirement of specific Christian rites. Following Raol's assurance that 'to live is glory and to die is gain', he goes on to instruct them: 'And being actually certain of victory, fall upon the enemy, the rewards of victory over whom are eternal glory.'[214] The priest concludes his oration with a final reiteration of this notion, whereby being justified with and guided by God the crusaders will be 'white and spotless in all respects and worthy of the heavenly fold, wherein is the abode of those who rejoice in the splendour of the saints.'[215] While *Lyxbonensi* stops short of claiming that those who would be killed were martyrs, it is clear that in the wake of the campaign the participants believed that their fallen comrades were martyrs.[216]

Although Throop has demonstrated the significance of the prescribed and continual enactment of Christian rites on the Lisbon campaign, it is

212 GA, p. 256. Pavlac, *A Warrior Bishop,* pp. 67–8.
213 GA, p. 256. Pavlac, *A Warrior Bishop,* p. 68.
214 DEL, pp. 156–7.
215 DEL, pp. 156–7.
216 Throop, 'Christian Communities', p. 105. Lay, 'Martyrs and the Cult of Henry the Crusader', p. 11.

nevertheless the case that appeals to salvation are consistently presented as independent of such rites. During his oration, Raol argues that God never fails to forgive those who make confession, but this is not an explicit call for confession before battle in the same fashion as the *Gesta Alberonis*, and crucially is a statement made in relation to divine aid not spiritual reward.[217] Moreover, that specific rites were not demanded as part of the text's appeals to salvation or heavenly reward is actually consistent with Throop's conclusions concerning the presentation of the social and religious practices in *Lyxbonensi* being continual and 'regular' rather than ad hoc. Rather than rites, it is the intentions and actions of the crusaders which are associated with these appeals. Raol claims that if the crusaders wish to be forgiven for their sins they need to pray,[218] and if they have found themselves straying from God, they must repent.[219] Such a formulation of these appeals is consistent with the rhetoric of First Crusade orations, where the enactment of Christian rites is also often absent and is instead presented alongside reference to the actions and intentions of the crusaders. The penitential nature of the crusaders' undertaking, in the fashion of First Crusade narratives, remains central to appeals of heavenly reward as found in *Lyxbonensi*. While suffering is not utilized as an appeal within the text's battle rhetoric, in the same way it is found in certain First Crusade orations,[220] the text is explicit about the danger and hardship of the journey. The sea storm for example marks a specific moment of conversion[221] and both Raol and Bishop Peter emphasize repentance and the meritorious action of the crusaders in diverting their journey, with Peter arguing:

> Be not seduced by the desire to press on with the journey which you have begun; for the praiseworthy thing is not to have been to Jerusalem, but to have lived a good life along the way; for you cannot arrive there except through the performance of His works. Truly, it is through good works that anyone deserves to come to a glorious end.[222]

The devotional aspect of the hardship faced by the crusaders, as well as being in line with how such notions are constructed in First Crusade narratives, serves to distinguish the text from non-crusading contemporary orations. While an oration by Helmold includes reference to the homes, wives and children left behind in order to campaign, this is done not in a penitential sense but referenced as part of the personal indignities committed

217 DEL, pp. 154–5.
218 DEL, p. 152.
219 DEL, p. 152.
220 RM, p. 39, 74. FC, p. 246. AA, p. 306–7.
221 DEL, p. 60.
222 DEL, pp. 78–9.

upon the audience by their enemies.[223] The oration by Otto of Freising, delivered by Frederick I, also references the dangers and hardships undertaken by his soldiers but again in a non-religious fashion, arguing that such tribulations will one day be remembered fondly.[224] Where William of Tyre employs suffering as part of his only long *oratio recta*, it is presented by Duke Godfrey as being preferable to safety if avoiding suffering and death means that the crusaders will be unable to avenge their fallen brethren, this being expressed in the fashion of *strenuitas patrum*.[225]

Being absent of reference to Christian rites, as part of its appeals to salvation or heavenly reward, sets *Lyxbonensi* apart from certain contemporaries, but it is not the case that all or even most other orations written during the period 1145–1187 include such a formulation. Nor it is the case that *Lyxbonensi* conforms entirely to the common form of such appeals found in First Crusade narratives. For, although *Lyxbonensi*, Aelred's *Relatio*, Helmold's *Chronica* and the account of William of Tyre all include appeals to salvation without reference to specific rites, they are also united in that these appeals are always delivered by clerics as opposed to laymen. This is in contrast to many examples of such appeals from the early twelfth century, not only from a crusading context,[226] but also orations by authors such as Geoffrey of Monmouth.[227] This trend is all the more striking in works such as Aelred's *Relatio* where long and elaborate promises of divine aid are included in the orations of laymen such as Walter Espec, yet the assurance that the Anglo-Normans were fighting for the forgiveness of their sins is included in a curt aside before the beginning of the battle.[228] The only appeal to fighting for the remission of sin included in William of Tyre's work is in a harangue described as being delivered by the Patriarch of Jerusalem, while Helmold only presents such notions as being deployed by the pope to his own soldiers.[229] Where there is an exception to this pattern, such as in an oration in Lisiard's *Historia*,[230] it is notable that the speech upon which he based his own version, that being from Fulcher of Chartres, was a harangue centred upon the theme of salvation, and delivered by the King of Jerusalem.[231]

This trend is best understood within the broader context of attempted disentanglement of spiritual and temporal affairs in the twelfth century, exemplified in the canons of the First (1123) and Second (1139) Lateran

223 HB, p. 80.
224 Waitz, *Ottonis et Rahewini*, p. 148.
225 WT, pp. 275–6.
226 For examples see; RM, p. 39. GN, p. 156. BB, p. 45. AA, p. 460–1.
227 Reeve, *Geoffrey of Monmouth*, pp. 198–9.
228 RS, p. 195–6.
229 WT, p. 498–9. HB, p. 84.
230 LTC, 1603.
231 FC, p. 412.

Councils. While canon 7 of First Lateran re-established the episcopal authority at the centre of the *cura animarum*, canon 22 of Second Lateran shows a great deal of concern over the damage caused by the institution of 'false penances.'[232] This trend also correlates with a period wherein canonists such as Gratian and the Decretists increasingly sought to define and clarify the proper role of clergymen in warfare.[233] Indeed, many Decretists while maintaining Gratian's caution over clerical fighting, did not reiterate Gratian's ban on military service without papal permission, with Sicard of Cremona reflecting Decretist consensus by holding that prelates possessing regalia were expected to contribute their allotted soldiers to an army and to exhort hosts to fight a just war.[234] This understanding is aptly reflected by the *Gesta Alberonis* where the text makes clear that the same archiepiscopal authority that had allowed Albero to invest Herman, Count Palatine, also allowed him to gather soldiers, exhort an army and offer the remission of sin to combatants.[235]

Conclusion

Just as the unexpected success of the First Crusade was a driving force behind the proliferation of battle rhetoric in the early twelfth century, it is difficult to underestimate the impact of the failure of the Second Crusade upon the 'literary landscape' prior to 1187. Throop has posited that an understanding of the failure of the Second Crusade as God's punishment for mortal sins (*peccatis exigentibus hominum*) may have prompted avoidance of the terminology of vengeance in relation to the crusade. Owing to the association of vengeance with justice and God's will, a lack of success would necessarily imply the campaign was irreconcilable with divine direction.[236] A lack of success also appears to precipitate a lack of battle orations which, as previous chapters have argued, are often far less concerned with celebrating military virtues and prowess than engaging with a broader explanatory framework which often centres on righteous actions and intentions, along with divine direction. Failure did not necessarily contravene this framework, as defeats were suitable moments to craft examples of heroic sacrifice in battle, such as Walter the Chancellor's depiction of Roger of Salerno's

232 Henry Joseph Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation and Commentary* (St. Louis, MO, 1937), pp. 195–213.

233 Russell, *Just War,* pp. 68–87, 100–126.

234 Russell, *Just War*, pp. 109–10.

235 GA, p. 256. For the conflict over Albero's regalia see Ian S. Robinson 'Innocent II and the Empire', in *Pope Innocent II (1130–1143): The World vs. The City*, ed. by John Doran and Damian J. Smith (Abingdon, 2016), pp. 27–68.

236 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 86–7.

death, or that of the Frisians harangued by Gerlav the priest.[237] However, Throop understands the deployment of vengeance in *Lyxbonensi* as resultant of the early authorship of the text, prior to the collapse of the campaign to the Levant; yet it is evident that even allowing for an early draft of the text following the capture of the city, the elements of the text which utilize the language of vengeance were the same elements which underwent the most considerable reworking and elaboration. Despite detailing the only significant success of the Second Crusade, the lengths to which *Lyxbonensi*'s author goes to in justifying the diversion to Lisbon and incorporate the campaign within a recognizable ideological and theological framework betrays a degree of concern perhaps prompted by the contrast with the eastward mission, illustrated by Henry of Huntingdon's description.

A comparative analysis of the battle rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi* with early twelfth century crusading narratives, as well as with contemporary orations, naturally illuminates points of both continuity and change. In many respects the orations of *Lyxbonensi* reflect the same priorities of First Crusade narratives, although certain aspects receive far greater treatment than earlier examples in comparison, particularly explicit and extensive appeals to the necessity for right intention and unity amongst the crusading force, demands which ultimately vindicate the Anglo-Normans almost exclusively. Extensive treatment of right intention, unity and divine direction follows First Crusade examples and serves to demarcate the rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi* from a number of non-crusading contemporaries. However, conceptions of just or holy warfare did not possess totally clear lines even in the second half of the twelfth century and it is not difficult to find points of comparison between the rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi* and of orations depicting other sanctified conflicts. What does set *Lyxbonensi* apart from other contemporaries are its appeals to the symbol of the cross, notions of *imitatio Christi* and the *vita apostolica*, as well as the broader penitential depiction of the crusaders' undertaking, in contrast with soldiers who are provided with remission through the rites and representatives of the Church. In that same regard it is possible to place *Lyxbonensi* alongside other contemporary texts within a pattern of orations where an increasing emphasis was placed on notions of authority. This conforms with a broader understanding of the morality and legality of warfare in this period, wherein canonists, many of whom appear to have directly influenced oration authors, increasingly understood the enactment of just violence as the duty of legitimate authorities. This included not only a restriction of authority to the most powerful secular rulers, exemplified in the oration against Milan of Frederick Barbarossa, but also the Church. The concept of an 'independent power of material coercion' legitimately utilized by the Church had developed from before the turn of

237 'Galterii, cancellarii Antiocheni, Bella Antiochena, 1114–1119' in *Recueil des historiens des croisades: Historiens occidentaux, vol. 5* (Paris, 1895), p. 107. HB, pp. 124–5.

the twelfth century, but this power was increasingly consolidated, in particular following the Concordat of Worms and the Second Lateran Council.[238] However, there was no great line of distinction between these developments, with both canonists such as Gratian and churchmen such as Bernard of Clairvaux agreeing on the right of the Church to wield 'the spiritual and material sword.'[239] Church reforms of the second quarter of the twelfth century onwards may also help explain the dearth of appeals to salvation or heavenly reward which were delivered by laymen in this period, in contrast to the early twelfth century.

Lacking extended appeals to material wealth and martial virtue *Lyxbonensi* is comparable to other texts detailing sanctified conflicts such as Aelred's *Relatio*, where a concern over martial strength and secular honour is presented as chiefly the purview of sacrilegious criminal savages and those aiding them. Here the ultimate rejection of warfare is the conclusion of what reads as a lesson on moral reform. The example of the *Gesta Alberonis* and the *Gesta Frederici* also displays a far greater concern than many early twelfth-century orations over what sort of warfare could be considered just and righteous, and while not all of these examples make explicit reference to the work of contemporary canonists, several commentators have found these correspondences to be too conspicuous to discount.

In comparison with First Crusade orations, as well as non-crusading contemporary examples, the battle rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi* is even less concerned with appeals to specific *gentes* or *nationes*. These are entirely absent from Raol's sermon, and while such ideas do appear in Hervey of Glanville's speech, there is no recounting of past victories or any sense that evokes *strenuitas patrum* which could have been derived from *Quantum praedecessores*. Like First Crusade orations, however, the diverse force of crusaders is described in one speech as a single *gens*, defined by their faith. This is one of the several ways in which *Lyxbonensi* seems to construct crusading in a way which reflects First Crusade narratives rather than Second Crusade preaching or papal ideology. While there is no real sense of *strenuitas patrum*, the narrative centres its depiction of crusading on *imitatio Christi*, though *Quantum praedecessores* advanced the former rather than the latter. This is in spite of, as Purkis has demonstrated, the apparent effort by Eugenius III as well as Bernard of Clairvaux and his Cistercians to uncouple *imitatio Christi* from crusading, and instead emphasize the lifelong dedication demanded by that

238 Colin Morris, *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050 to 1250* (Oxford, 1989), p. 187.

239 Stanley Chodorow, *Christian Political Theory and Church Politics in the Mid-Twelfth Century: The Ecclesiology of Gratian's Decretum* (Los Angeles, 1972), pp. 226–7. John A. Watt, *The Theory of Papal Monarchy in the Thirteenth Century: The Contribution of the Canonists* (New York, 1965), p. 57. Bernard of Clairvaux, '*De Consideratione ad Eugenium Papam*' in Leclerq et al., *Sancti Bernardi opera*, iii, p. 454.

spiritual ideal, which was not found in transient crusaders, but only in members of the Military Orders.[240]

That Raol sought to defend the practice of crusading, its reputation seriously injured by the Second Crusade, from the 'competition' of the Military Orders, amongst the proliferation of forms of religious life, could account for the effort which the text makes in order to develop its central notions of righteous intention, repentance and divine direction, far beyond earlier orations. *Lyxbonensi*, as well as other texts such as Aelred's *Relatio*, displays forcefully how battle rhetoric, rather than revealing an underlying desire for wealth or vengeance borne of hatred, was influenced by or reflected corresponding ideals of, contemporary theologians and canonists.[241] Instead of being centrally concerned with military virtue, these works present righteous warfare as an opportunity for moral reform, and the development of virtues beyond the battlefield. It is difficult to tell how successfully these ideas were communicated to lay arms-bearers, if at all. However, in the case of *Lyxbonensi* and Aelred's *Relatio*, it is possible to clearly identify a lay audience who would have naturally been invested in the events these narratives depict. As is the case with earlier orations, far from being generic or interchangeable, battle rhetoric was highly situational, with any visible trends reflecting the political, religious and social context within which they were created. This context would shift radically from the end of the twelfth to the beginning of the thirteenth century and forms the subject Chapter Five.

240 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, pp. 85–117.
241 Bliese, 'Just War as Concept and Motive', pp. 11–14.

5 Vengeance, Martyrdom and Heroic Failure in Military Service to Christ

Introduction

Like Chapter Four, this chapter examines a single text in contrast with a broader corpus of contemporary battle rhetoric in order to explore the developments and enduring features of crusading orations. Its focus is the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, hereafter the *Itinerarium,*[1] and it will argue that the *Itinerarium* represents a notable shift in the crusading battle rhetoric, yet one that is identifiable within wider, though far from universal, trends. Most significantly, in its deployment and development of hitherto marginal martial or 'heroic' battle rhetoric, as well as its presentation of the previously dominant presence of divine aid appeals, the *Itinerarium* ultimately contrasts markedly with comparative orations in a fashion which serve to illuminate the priorities of its author.

More broadly, the chapter is centred on the period between the Battle of Hattin, 4 July 1187, and the failure and aftermath of the Fifth Crusade (1217–1221). These few decades have been long recognized as a highpoint of crusading activity, which was backed by a series of popes eager to support the practice of holy war, most notable of whom was Innocent III (*r.* 8 January 1198–16 July 1216). Beyond the Third Crusade, these decades encompassed two further large-scale expeditions to the East; a significant turnaround of Christian fortunes in the Iberian Peninsula following Las

1 Where it is necessary to distinguish between the Itinerarium commonly attributed to Richard de Templo, represented herein by the Stubbs edition, and the earlier anonymous Latin prose account upon which he drew, I have employed the designation of previous commentators, specifically using 'IP1' to refer to the chronologically earlier text, and 'IP2' to identify the later narrative. The most recent and detailed examination of the origins of IP1 has been undertaken by Helen Nicholson. Helen J. Nicholson, 'The Construction of a Primary Source: The Creation of Itinerarium Peregrinorum 1', *Cahiers de Recherches Medieval et Humanistes*, 37: 1 (2019). I would like to thank Professor Nicholson for allowing me to consult the paper prior to its publication. All translations of the *Itinerarium* have been taken from Professor Nicholson's English rendering of the Stubb's edition, Nicholson, *Chronicle*.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003044611-6

Navas de Tolosa on 16 July 1212; the Albigensian Crusade (1209–1229), which also prompted authors to pen battle orations;[2] the popular movement often called the Children's Crusade of 1212, and also the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215.

Like *Lyxbonensi*, the text of the *Itinerarium*, although having its origins close to the events detailed by the narrative, was not the product of a single phase of work. An exploration of the context of the *Itinerarium* therefore requires a broad scope that accounts for the circumstances of the Third Crusade, as well as subsequent decades which would see the work expanded, reworked and revised.[3]

The Context of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi

Although the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem had, early in the second half of the twelfth century, been capable of mounting serious attacks upon Muslim enemies in Egypt, following the siege of Damietta in 1169, its military operations were essentially defensive. While vigorous defence of the kingdom was maintained by Baldwin IV, in 1187, Sultan Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Ayyūb conducted an invasion that capitalized upon the political divisions which had plagued the Latins throughout the 1180s. Disaster had been foreseen throughout that decade, precipitating appeals to the West such as that of Patriarch Heraclius of Jerusalem in 1184, though a notable response from Christendom was only forthcoming after 1187.[4]

In that year, Saladin invaded the kingdom with greater strength than ever before and Ayyubid forces, led by Muzaffar ad-Din Gökböri, were, on 1 May, victorious at the Battle of 'the Spring of Cresson'.[5] This encounter saw a great many members of the Military Orders, including Roger des Moulins, Master of the Hospital, killed. Soon after, Saladin himself attacked Tiberias and when the army of the kingdom of Jerusalem attempted to respond, it was outmanoeuvred and forced onto poor ground without the chance to reach a water supply. On 4 July, this beleaguered force was

2 Pascal Guébin and Ernest Lyon (eds.), *Petri Vallium Sarnaii monachi Historia Albigensis*, 3 vols (Paris, 1926–1939), i, p. 268, ii, p. 152.

3 The historiography of the Third Crusade has been notably surveyed recently by Stephen Spencer. Stephen J. Spencer, 'The Third Crusade in Historiographical Perspective', *History Compass*, 19: 7 (2021).

4 Riley-Smith, *Crusades*, p. 84–7. For further context and information on events of 1187 also see Bernard Hamilton, *The Leper King and His Heirs: Baldwin IV and the Crusader Kingdom of* Jerusalem (Cambridge, 2000).

5 Often called the Springs of Cresson, though the Pringle attribution has been used here. Denys Pringle, 'The Spring of the Cresson in Crusading History', in Michel Balard, Benjamin Z. Kedar and Jonathan Riley-Smith (eds.) *Dei gesta per Francos: Etudes sur les croisades dediees a Jean Richard* (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 231–40.

devastated in battle by Saladin at the Horns of Hattin, with King Guy being taken captive along with the relic of the True Cross and hundreds of knights, although many others, including all members of the Military Orders and Reynald of Châtillon Lord of Oultrejordain, were executed.[6] Jerusalem would surrender to Saladin after only a brief siege on 2 October in that same year and while this would be recognized as a grievous blow, it is clear that a response from the papacy had already been prepared even before the Curia received this news.[7] The reaction which this defeat provoked from the West was a watershed moment in the history of crusading. It would tremendously influence both the practice of holy war, in the form of the Third Crusade, as well as the ideological development of the movement, which would be significantly and increasingly codified and institutionalized during the papacy of Innocent III and beyond. More specifically, Christopher Tyerman has argued that it was the events of 1187 which prompted an almost immediate definition or redefinition of a crusader which was distinct from the understanding of a pilgrim.[8] Much of this process would be centred on the cross, which from Hattin onwards was increasingly associated with holy war in Western preaching.[9] Furthermore, while the campaigns of the Third Crusade would be of interest to numerous commentators, the events of 1187 specifically seemed to arouse historical interest, likely being the prompt for Ralph of Coggeshall began his work on the *Chronicon Anglicanum*.[10]

Central to the papacy's answer to Hattin was *Audita tremendi*, issued, reworked and reissued, in the days after the death of Urban III by his successor Gregory VIII.[11] This impassioned encyclical, described by Riley-Smith as 'one of the most moving documents of crusading history',[12] emphasized God's anger, lamented the plight of the East and simultaneously called for an expedition to save the kingdom, as well as for the repentance of all Christians, whose sin had brought about the tragedies that had unfolded.[13] Like *Quantum praedecessores*, the bull served as a basis for the sermonizing and preaching required for recruitment. Moreover, while it is difficult to ascertain to what extent *Audita tremendi* shaped the battle

6 Andrew Jotischky, *Crusading and the Crusader States* (Harlow, 2004), pp. 101–2.

7 Riley-Smith, *Crusades*, p. 109.

8 See Christopher Tyerman, 'Were There Any Crusades in the Twelfth Century?', *English Historical Review* 110, 437 (1995), pp. 573–5.

9 Beverly Mayne Kienzle, 'Preaching the Cross: Liturgy and Crusade Propaganda', *Medieval Sermon Studies*, 53 (2009), p. 20.

10 Staunton, *Historians of Angevin England,* p. 40.

11 For recent and valuable critical work on *Audita tremendi*, see Thomas W. Smith, '*Audita Tremendi* and the Call for the Third Crusade Reconsidered, 1187–1188', *Viator*, 43: 3 (2018), pp. 63–101.

12 Riley-Smith, *Crusades*, p. 109.

13 For the text of *Audita tremendi,* 'Gregorii VIII Papæ Epistolæ et Privilegia'., in *Opera Omnia Urbani III, Gregorii VIII, Romanorum Pontificum Epistolae et Privilegia, PL*, 202, 1539–1542. HEF, pp. 6–10.

rhetoric of Third Crusade narratives, the bull itself actually deployed language common to twelfth-century battle rhetoric, including an oration from 1 Maccabees, as well as the words of Deuteronomy 32:30.[14]

Organized and extensive preaching, economic preparation, commitment by powerful monarchs as well as a significant strain of lay devotion, resulted in a response which, though momentous, was not without division, particularly between the Angevins and Capetians. Nevertheless, despite significant setbacks, most crucially the death of Frederick Barbarossa in Asia Minor, crusading forces comprising peoples from across Latin Christendom participated in military efforts which, while unsuccessful in recapturing Jerusalem, brought the Latin East back from the brink of total collapse. Both German and French authors were able to craft narratives of the expedition from the perspectives of their respective monarchs, but the departure of Philip II from the East after the capture of Acre in 1191 and the death of the Emperor Frederick a year earlier, prompting the disintegration of the single greatest force of all the crusader kings, ensured that it would be Richard I who loomed largest in contemporary historiography. The exploits of the Lionheart, such as his defeat of Saladin at Arsuf and rush to save Jaffa, were detailed by a number of contemporary writers, evidently capturing imaginations in England, the continent and beyond.[15] Writing in 1192, a Nestorian Christian of Mosul described Richard arriving at Acre as 'the young lion, the king of England, the shining light. He fought without pause both night and day'.[16]

While Richard's efforts, and those of German crusaders in 1197, saw the Latin East almost completely recovered, it was impossible to recognize a campaign that had failed to recover Jerusalem or the True Cross as a success. The evident frustration on the part of many supporters of the crusading movement, including the papacy, at the reality in the East, which seemed to resist the age-old explanatory framework of repentance leading to victory, can be seen in the sustained efforts at crusade preparation in the final years of the twelfth century and early decades of the thirteenth. Innocent III's *Post miserabile* broke the mould of crusading encyclicals for not being a response to a specific crisis, but also for its criticism of previous crusade efforts. As well as depicting the mockeries of the Islamic enemy against the French, English, Germans and Spanish,[17] the advancement of the standard understanding of divine aid as contingent upon the avoidance of sin is formulated in a manner damning of previous unsuccessful crusaders:

14 Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges*, pp. 8–9.
15 Staunton, *Historians of Angevin England*, pp. 237–81.
16 Jean Richard, *L'Esprit de la Croisade* (Paris, 1969), pp. 116–9.
17 RH, iv, p. 71.

> We also wish you not to despair of the divine mercy, however much the Lord may be offended by our sins. If you set out upon your pilgrimage with all humility of heart and body, as you ought to do, the Lord may effect that which he did not grant to your forefathers. Probably, our forefathers might have conspired together and would have said, 'our own high hand and not the Lord has done all this'. And they would have ascribed the glory of the victory to themselves and not to the Lord. We also trust that the Lord will not in his wrath withhold his mercies, since when he is angered he does not forget to show mercy, admonishing and exhorting us, saying, 'Turn unto me and I will turn unto you'. We believe that you should walk in the law of the Lord, not following in the footsteps of those who, going after vanity, have become vain and given themselves up to riotous living and drunken revelries and done things in parts beyond the sea which they would not dare to do in the land of their own birth without having to endure great infamy and considerable disgrace.[18]

Such a representation of previous expeditions to the East contrasts sharply with emphasis placed upon the emulation of crusading forefathers in crusade preaching and recruitment of the mid-twelfth century.[19] Despite successes in the diversifying theatres of crusading activity outside of the Holy Land in the early thirteenth century, papal and popular dissatisfaction with crusading remained evident, particularly after 1204.[20] A crusading sermon produced and delivered sometime between 1213 and 1217, as part of the preparations for the Fifth Crusade, contains condemnations similar to those found in *Post miserabile*:

> There are seven kinds of wild beasts in this world. The lions of pride, such as knights and certain thieves, the snakes of envy, such as those who rejoice in another's sin. You wallow in the sins of your fathers, yet rejoice in the sin of priests […] The wild boar is those who are irascible. The wild ass is those who are despairing. The foxes of cupidity are deceitful merchants. Of which there was a certain man who used to say "I'll put them [that is, my coins] into my 'wicked profit', calling his purse 'wicked profit'. Of the hawkers and the mongers, they are as many as they are varied. Of the hostelers, who are traitors; they are a gluttonous

18 RH, iv, pp. 74–5. Jessalynn Bird, Edward Peters and James M. Powell (eds.), *Crusade and Christendom: Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187–1291* (Philadelphia, PA, 2013), pp. 36–7.

19 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, p. 86–118.

20 Peter Raedts, 'The Children's Crusade of 1212', *Journal of Medieval History*, 3 (1977), pp. 279–323.

> bear who makes a larder of his belly. […] Concerning the story of the boy slain by the drunkard's stench, that was the pig of lust.[21]

This sermon also illustrates how the practice of crusading was, in the reign of Innocent III and beyond, forcefully and continually related to broader Church and societal reform in its denunciation of certain evils, particularly usury.[22] The encyclical of 1213 *Quia maior* makes no reference to the 'deeds of the fathers' but does repeat Urban II's injunction, expressed by Matthew 16:24, for a crusader to 'take up his cross and follow me'.[23] While the fact that Jerusalem continued to elude Christian possession brought a renewed sense of relevancy to a lot of Urban's rhetoric, there was much which separated crusading in 1095 from crusading in 1187 and beyond, particularly in regards to notions of salvation and the formulation of the indulgence.[24]

Incepted during or shortly after the events of the Third Crusade, and only likely reaching its final form around the turn of the thirteenth century, perhaps even as late as c. 1216–1220, the *Itinerarium* is thus the product of a period that featured several highpoints in crusade enthusiasm. However, between 1192 and the 1220s, there would be considerable developments not only in the theory and practice of crusading, but also notably in the socio-political landscape of the Angevin world. As well as being utilized to defend the famed expedition of Richard I against contemporary criticism of past crusaders, the *Itinerarium* championed the memory of heroic Angevin and English crusade efforts into the thirteenth century. It's evidently partisan vision was promulgated during or shortly preceding a time when territorial losses, military defeats, political upheaval and disputes with the papacy so marred the reign of King John, with England being seriously weakened by external enemies and internal strife.[25] With the English king in his minority by 1216, it would be the higher lay nobility, whose deeds on the Third Crusade, the *Itinerarium,* goes to such lengths to valourize, who would in many ways bear the burdens of rule. That the strife between England and France was

21 Jessalynn Bird, 'The Victorines, Peter the Chanter's Circle, and the Crusade: Two Unpublished Crusading Appeals in Paris, *Bibliothe`que Nationale*, Ms. Latin 14470', *Medieval Sermon Studies*, 48 (2004), p. 27.

22 Bird, 'The Victorines', pp. 25–8. Jessalynn Bird, 'Reform or Crusade? Anti-Usury and Crusade Preaching During the Pontifcate of Innocent III', in John C. Moore (ed.) *Pope Innocent III and His World* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 165–85.

23 'XXVIII universis christi fidelibus per maguntinensem provinciam constitutes. De negotio terræ sanctæ – Innocentii III Romani Pontificus Regestorum Sive Epistolarum Liber XVI'. in *Innocentii III Opera Omnia, PL,* 216, vol. 3, 817.

24 Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, pp. 277–8. Tyerman, 'Were There Any Crusades in the Twelfth Century?', p. 560. Riley-Smith, *Crusades*, pp. 97–8, 108, 121–2.

25 Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 11–2.

obstructive to crusading efforts was well recognized by Innocent III[26] who prompted King John to take the cross and supported his cause against the rebel barons.[27] Moreover, beyond John's reign crusading enthusiasm and activity was far from absent in England, with English crusaders participating in the Fifth Crusade and assembling in significant numbers for another expedition again in 1227.[28]

Text

While the Rolls Series edition, edited by William Stubbs, identifies the *Itinerarium* as being written by Richard, Canon of the Holy Trinity London, the text as Stubbs presents is a composite work with a complex history.[29] In the introduction to his 1962 edition, Hans Mayer convincingly argued for the distinction between the longer compilation text (the so-called 'IP2'), which included material from Ralph of Diceto, Roger of Howden and a Latin translation of Ambroise's *Estoire de la guerre sainte*, from the so called 'IP1' based on the manuscript of Jacques Bongars or the 'G' manuscript.[30] It was this text, which included only part of Book I, that seems to have circulated separately, being known to William of Newburgh in 1197 for example,[31] before being utilized by a later compiler. Concerning the author, Helen Nicholson has posited that the most likely conclusion is that 'IP1', which was not itself entirely original, drawing from a Latin prose account of the crusade of Frederick Barbarossa amongst other sources,[32] was written by an English crusader, perhaps at least in part in the crusade camp between August 1191 and September 1192.[33] This latter dates takes derives, at least in part, from the section detailing Frederick Barbarossa's expedition, which indicates that the bones of the Emperor were transported to Tyre, intending to then be moved onto Jerusalem. According to Mayer, this section must have been written before 2 September 1192, the date of the accord between Richard and Saladin that left *Jerusalem* in Saladin's control,[34] though this detail alone is perhaps insufficient for a hard *terminus ante quem*. Nicholson has also done much towards identifying the author of 'IP1' as a cleric of

26 James M. Powell (trans.) *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III by an Anonymous Author* (Washington D.C., 2007), p. xliv.
27 Christopher R. Cheney, *Pope Innocent III and England* (Stuttgart, 1976), pp. 147–54, 304–56.
28 Riley-Smith, *Crusades*, pp. 145–51.
29 Nicholson, *Chronicle*, pp. 6–14.
30 Hans E. Mayer (ed.), *Das Itinerarium Peregrinorum. Eine zeitgenössische englische Chronik zum dritten Kreuzzug in ursprünglicher Gestalt* (Stuttgart, 1962), pp. 1–44.
31 IP, p. lxix.
32 Staunton, *Historians of Angevin England*, p. 143.
33 Nicholson, *Chronicle*, pp. 9–10. Nicholson, 'The Construction of a Primary Source', p. 144.
34 'The Construction of a Primary Source', p. 144. Mayer, *Das Itinerarium*, p. 103, 302.

considerable education, within the sphere or even service of Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury. This sphere included Latinists of proven skill, Joseph of Exeter being a possible candidate, who, unlike Geoffrey of Vinsauf, is known to have taken part in the Third Crusade. While a younger Richard de Templo, widely accepted to be the author of 'IP2', was a likely participant, differences in style and content have been argued by Nicholson to remove him from the running. Yet, it is not inconceivable that an author's style, or priorities in determining the content of his prose, might shift considerably between the time of the Third Crusade and the first few decades of the thirteenth century, indeed, changing circumstances would perhaps necessitate the latter.[35]

Although 'IP2' was once attributed to the poet Geoffrey of Vinsauf, Stubbs and Mayer argued for its identification with Richard de Templo, Augustinian canon of Holy Trinity, Aldgate, in London, who would be Prior there from *c.* 1222 to *c.* 1250.[36] He was in fact identified as such by the author of the finalized *Libellus de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum* who recommends the *Itinerarium* as further reading.[37] While both Stubbs and Mayer proposed that Richard de Templo had at one time been a Templar, the theory of a Templar origin to the *Itinerarium* has been disputed by Hannes Möhring and Nicholson on the basis of inaccuracies or omissions of information which would have been of tremendous importance to members of the order.[38] The dating of the *Itinerarium* is likewise a thorny problem. While 'IP2' drew upon many sources which would have been circulating by the late-1190s, most notably Amboise's *Estoire*[39] as well as 'IP1', which is thought to have been compiled early in that decade, most hold to a dating around 1217–1220,[40] and not after 1222, the *terminus post quem* of the *Libellus*. A recent work, forthcoming by Stephen Spencer, will challenge both the commonly accepted date and identification of Richard de Templo as the author of 'IP2', who henceforth will be referred to as 'the IP2 author'.[41]

The complete text of the *Itinerarium* survives in seven manuscripts, although including incomplete texts, this number increases to 12, which represent four distinct versions of the text. The earliest of these is Bognar's G

35 'The Construction of a Primary Source', pp. 146, 155–9.

36 Mayer, *Das Itinerarium*, pp. 89–106. *Itinerarium*, pp. xl–lxix. IP, p. lxvii.

37 LTS, p. 236.

38 Hannes Möhring, 'Eine Chronik aus der Zeit des Dritten Kreuzzugs: das sogenannte Itinerarium peregrinorum 1', *Innsbrucker Historische Studien*, 5 (1982), pp. 149–62. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, pp. 7–8, 164–5.

39 AM, ii, p. 2.

40 Mayer, *Das Itinerarium*, pp. 105–6.

41 I would like to thank Stephen for allowing me to consult an unpublished version of his forthcoming article. Stephen J. Spencer, 'The Composition Date of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi (IP2) Reconsidered', *The English Historical Review* (forthcoming).

manuscript, what Stubbs called the B manuscript, Cotton MS Faustina A vii.[42] Stubbs's A manuscript is Cambridge University Library MS Ff.1.25.4, a manuscript of the thirteenth century which, as well as the *Itinerarium* therein attributed by the rubric to Geoffrey of Vinsauf, contains extracts from Geoffrey's *Poetria nova*, and the *Historia Damiatina* of Oliver of Paderborn. The C manuscript of the Stubbs edition is MS. 129 Corpus Christi College Cambridge.[43] Manuscript evidence and the apparent use of IP1 by contemporary writers, not only William of Newburgh but also Gerald of Wales as well as the author of the *Latin Continuation of William of Tyre*, attests to the popularity of that text, which records events from 1187 down to the arrival of Richard I at Acre. Nicholson has argued that there are three identifiable elements to the string of events: an account of the disasters of 1187 to 1189 which was compiled from oral reports from crusaders, the German prose account and a predominantly eyewitness account of the siege of Acre, all of which were compiled together by an Englishman sometime before September 1192.[44]

While the chronological separation between IP1 and IP2 raises questions as to the historical value of the remainder of the text found in Books II–VI, IP2 was obviously written with serious consultation of texts produced much closer to the events it describes. These sources included other Latin works such as those of Ralph of Diceto and Roger of Howden, as well as the most extensive text upon which the IP2 author drew, an Old French verse account of the crusade, *L'Estoire de la guerre sainte* of Ambroise. There is a strong case for the dating of *L'Estoire* being between 1194 and 1198, as it notes Richard I's release from captivity in Austria yet makes no mention of his death. That the monastic author of a crusading narrative would draw so extensively (although in a fashion that is perhaps more nuanced than has often been recognized) upon vernacular verse seems striking, given the traditionally perceived gulf between vernacular and Latin works particularly regarding aims and audience.[45] However, it has been argued by recent editors of Ambroise, an individual otherwise unknown beyond what his work reveals, that he was perhaps a Norman cleric of minor orders, as opposed to *jongleur* writing from the point of view of a simple soldier, perhaps even being identifiable in the Liberate Rolls of 1200.[46] While clearly influenced by

42 IP, p. lxxi. Staunton, *Historians of Angevin England*, p. 144.

43 IP, p. lxxii.

44 Nicholson, *Chronicle*, pp. 10–5.

45 On this matter, as well as how many twelfth-century vernacular texts challenge this perceived gulf, see Peter Damien-Grint, *New Historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (Woodbridge, 1999).

46 AM, ii, p. 1–3. Cf. John Gillingham, *Richard the Lionheart* (London, 1989), p. 145. Thomas D. Hardy (ed.), *Rotuli de liberate ac de misis et praestitis, regnante Johanne* (London, 1844), p. 1. Thomas D. Hardy (ed.) *Rotuli normanniae in Turri londinensi asservati, Johanne et Henrico quinto, Angliæ regibus* (London, 1835), p. 34.

the tradition of *chansons de geste*, Ambroise's work is notable for his extensive and rather highbrow rhetoric, in comparison to the more colloquial language of the *chansons*. Moreover, the text's moral and didactic elements are too prominent to be ignored, and likewise distinguished from contemporary vernacular works.[47] This no doubt made *L'Estoire* suitable as a source for the IP2 author, and while concordantly the *Itinerarium* as a Latin narrative is set apart by the amount of epic or heroic material it contains, which primarily serves to valourize Richard I and the crusaders of 1189–1192, a closer examination of how the IP2 author constructed his work serves to further blur the distinctions upon which traditional notions of aims and audience rest. Far from diminishing heroic or epic textual elements in order to produce a more theocentric account of a sanctified conflict, the author adds to Ambroise's narrative epic and heroic elements, many of which are identifiable with the *chanson* tradition, himself. While Ambroise's account would certainly prove more accessible to an audience without a firm grasp of Latin, it does not seem to be the case that a lay audience with an interest in or connection to the crusading movement, and a largely professed religious audience with a perhaps more serious interest in the course of the crusade, are easily or even desirably, delineated.[48] Neither work seems to have been intended for the kind of public recitation which was typical of the epic or romance, and it has previously been suggested that the same circles of educated nobility who would have enjoyed reading or hearing Ambroise's work would have similarly enjoyed the *Itinerarium*.[49] While the extensive use of direct speech in *L'Estoire* has also drawn the attention of modern commentators, highlighting instances such as the speech of the Poitevin priest William to Richard I,[50] it is important to note that regarding battle rhetoric the IP2 author not only crafts original orations, but also extends the hortatory rhetoric found in *L'Estoire*.

That there was something appealing about the *Itinerarium* to readers in the late-twelfth and early thirteenth century is evidenced not just by the circulation of IP1 but also the manuscript tradition of IP2. Indeed, by comparison, Ambroise's *Estoire* was less successful, now being fully extant in only a single corrupt manuscript, Vatican Regina 1659. Beyond inserting original orations, the IP2 author adds 'amazing stories' intended to enliven the narrative, which he perhaps gathered himself as a younger man through

47 AM, ii, pp. 20–1. Sarah Kay, 'The Nature of Rhetoric in the Chansons de Geste', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 94 (1978), pp. 304–20.

48 AM, ii, pp. 20–3. Staunton, *Historians of Angevin England*, p. 146.

49 Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 15.

50 AM, ii, p. 20–1. Sophie Marnette, 'Narrateur et point de vue dans les chroniques médiévales: une approche linguistique', *The Medieval Chronicle: Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Utrecht, 13–16 July 1996*, ed. by Erik Kooper (Amsterdam, 1999), pp. 176–90.

participation in the crusade.[51] Although this can only be speculated upon, the text itself certainly asserts a level of familiarity with the reality of campaigning and battle, describing in great detail the fear experienced during combat:[52] 'How distant, how different is the life of contemplation and meditation among the columns of the cloister from that dreadful exercise of war!'[53]

Furthermore, it is difficult to doubt the appeal of his central aims. Set forth in his *prologus*, the IP2 author claims that the passage of time can cause even extraordinary events to fade from memory, even if such deeds once served to inspire others. Referencing both classical heroes and Church Fathers, he emphasizes the recollection and celebration of *virtutes*.[54] As will be argued later, this focus upon the heroes of the Third Crusade and their deeds is reflected in the character and nature of the battle rhetoric of the *Itinerarium*. These speeches seamlessly support a wider narrative which attempts a detailed and vigorous defence of crusaders of a generation prior to the Fifth Crusade, who were identified in papal documents such as *Post miserabile* as sinners and failures, and who '*Par nostre surfaite folie*',[55] were the cause not only of their lack of military success in the East, but the downfall of the kingdom of Jerusalem and the loss of the holy city.

The *Itinerarium* contains eight instances of battle rhetoric, including examples of both *oratio recta* and *oratio obliqua*, although the former occurs more frequently than the latter. While Richard I delivers much of the text's battle rhetoric, this is not exclusively the case. There are two instances of *oratio recta* in Book I, those being a short speech by an unnamed Frankish soldier of the kingdom of Jerusalem,[56] as well as another brief oration which occurs during a naval encounter and is delivered by the crusader Ivo de Vipont, as part of a story not included by Ambroise. In Book II, Richard I also gives an oration at sea, which is significantly extended from the *Estoire* version.[57] In Book III, Chapter 13 begins with an instance of *oratio obliqua*, again delivered by a 'public crier' on behalf of Richard I.[58] The next speech, found in Book IV, takes place during the Battle of Arsuf, being delivered by an unnamed member of the Knights Hospitaller.[59] The final three speeches are all delivered by Richard I, one being a brief oration during the campaign following Arsuf, the other two

51 Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 16.
52 IP, p. 264.
53 IP, p. 270. Nicholson, *Chronicle,* p. 15.
54 IP, pp. 3–4.
55 AM, i, p. 1.
56 IP, p. 69.
57 IP, p. 207. AM, i, pp. 35–6.
58 IP, p. 225.
59 IP, p. 268. AM, i, p. 103.

taking place at the Battle of Jaffa in August 1192.[60] As well as these orations, the IP2 author includes other instances of direct speech which, although they do not take place before battle, are hortatory in nature and contain many themes and notions common to battle rhetoric. Most notable of these is the speech of William, the priest to King Richard, found in Book V and drawn from Ambroise.[61]

Themes

Martial Virtue

As has previously been demonstrated, prior to 1187, references to and calls for martial virtues, or the public recognition of such virtues, understood as glory, honour or fame were, often, not the essential focus of battle orations. This was particularly the case in the context of crusading. Ecclesiastical commentators of the crusading movement throughout the early to mid-twelfth century repeatedly made clear the problems of boastfulness and pride, to which successful warriors were particularly susceptible. Their warnings and didactic *exempla* against these faults went hand-in-hand with many other moral lessons concerning proper behaviour and were, in a crusading context at least, inseparable from the attitude of penitential devotion which the Church demanded of crusaders. Only such devotion, and the necessitated avoidance of sin, would merit divine aid and preclude defeat, understood usually as divine correction.

Often undeveloped and dependent on other rhetorical appeals, the invocation of martial virtues seem just as marginal, if not more so, in many orations of the middle decades of the twelfth century. The literary construction of pious, humble and often explicitly reformed warriors in armed contest against pagans, heretics or unreformed Christians even of high standing, what Bernard of Clairvaux called the old knighthood, was not limited to a crusading context.

Through the work of canon lawyers, many of the precepts of holy war, in particular regarding the intent and behaviour of soldiers, came to form the strictures of defining conflicts as just wars, and even crusade preachers such as Jacques de Vitry presented the holy war he sought to recruit combatants for as a 'just war'.[62] Church authorities in the early thirteenth century maintained the common explanatory framework within which much of twelfth-century crusading battle rhetoric is best understood. Essential to this framework, and often repeated both in crusading orations and the wider narratives within which they are found, is the need for combatants to place

60 IP, pp. 407–8. AM, i, pp. 185–6.

61 IP, pp. 361–4. AM, i, pp. 154–6.

62 Bird, Peters and Powell, *Crusade and Christendom*, p. 148. Brundage, 'The Hierarchy of Violence', p. 676.

their trust and faith in the divine, rather than in their own efforts, the latter being a mindset inseparable from prideful sin.

The *Itinerarium* illustrates the traditional framework early on through the battle orations found in Book I. Prior to a battle which took place on 4 October 1189, the text claims that the sight of the massed ranks of an army under the leadership of King Guy, which included contingents of both Templars and Hospitallers, prompted a sacrilegious boast:

> One person, carried away with pleasure at the sight of the army, dared to say: 'What power can overcome it, what great number can resist it? God can do nothing for us nor our adversaries! Our own valour (*virtute*) will win us the victory'. This was certainly a most evil and damnable remark which made human rather than Divine power responsible for the outcome of the battle, since without God we can do nothing [John 15:5]. Sad experience and the outcome of events proved this.[63]

The message this instance intends to convey is far from subtle, and the text makes clear the link between the sinful outburst and the misfortune which soon after overtook the same army. The theme of God's power and the need to trust in Him in order to achieve victory reappears consistently throughout Book I. When the sailors accompanying Ivo de Vipont, petrified at the sight of Turkish pirates, exclaimed: 'Lord God, alas for us!' saying to each other, 'we're caught! We'll be cut to pieces', the knight supposedly responded succinctly: 'What O ye of little faith', said Ivo de Vipont to them, 'are you afraid, when in a moment you will see them dead?'[64]

Following a brief description of the successful boarding of the enemy galley, the text once again makes clear the lesson:

> Thus those who placed their hope in God were given a triumph, for He did not allow them to be conquered. It was their unfeigned faith which gave them strength, rather than a large number of fighters; because it is of no consequence to God whether there are few or many. He gives strength for the battle and total victory.[65]

Book I also devotes significant attention to explaining the triumphs of Saladin, whom it portrays as arrogantly boasting about his victories over the Kingdom of Jerusalem, only to be mocked by a fool, supposedly inspired by God:

> God the Father of the faithful judged that the delinquent Christians should be rebuked and corrected and took you, O prince, to serve his

63 IP, p. 69. Nicholson, *Chronicle,* p. 78.
64 IP, p. 104. Nicholson, *Chronicle,* p. 108.
65 IP, p. 104. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 108.

> purpose- just as a worldly father sometimes when he is enraged grabs a filthy stick from the mud with which to beat his erring sons, and then throws it back into the dungpit from which he took it.[66]

Although far from being totally unconcerned with maintaining this particular didactic theme, instances of battle rhetoric from Book I certainly contrast in their priorities with many of the subsequent orations of the *Itinerarium*. Throughout Books II–VI, martial virtue, particularly courage, as well as feats of arms and prowess are continually highlighted. At the climax of the fighting around Jaffa, the *Itinerarium* describes Richard arraying his forces before an oration which opens with an extensive appeal to courage and virtue:

> When each person was arranged like this, as far as the lack of time and the small numbers allowed, the king ran up and down between them, like the active encourager he was. He urged them to be steadfast, condemning as unworthy of their race (*degeneres*) those whose spirits weakened from fear and cowardice. 'Oppose the adversary with a firm and fearless mind', he said. 'Let courage grow in your breasts to resist the fierce enemy and escape the storms of fortune. Learn to endure adversities, since everything is bearable to those of manly character. Adversities reveal virtues, just as prosperity hides them'.[67]

As well as forming unusually well-developed appeals in instances of battle rhetoric, the *Itinerarium* displays its concern with the celebration of human virtues in myriad other ways. Rather than religious reference, courage in the text's final oration is framed as being born from necessity,[68] in a fashion similar to how the author of the *Historia Peregrinorum* has Frederick, Duke of Swabia, call for strength.[69] Prowess, as well as virtues such as courage and loyalty, are described as being essential to averting disaster and defeat throughout the *Itinerarium*. It is through Richard's own prowess, as well as the bravery and self-sacrifice of the knight, William des Préaux, that the king evades capture. While this story is also recorded by Ambroise, the IP2 author uniquely returns to the subject of William in a continuation of the same anecdote:

> As the Turks were departing rather swiftly, our people went back to the army, rejoicing exuberantly in the Lord over the fact that they had been received safe and sound. Their relief was greater because he had almost

66 IP, p. 31. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 46.
67 IP, pp. 416–7. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 362.
68 IP, p. 417.
69 HP, p. 168.

perished through wandering about so dangerously. Yet they felt a great sorrow for William des Préaux, who had freely given himself to the enemy with such loyal generosity, redeeming his lord the king with his own body. What commendable loyalty! What rare devotion![70]

Though it may perhaps seem obvious to read into this story an understanding of the self-sacrifice of crusaders as Christ-like, this is in no way explicit in the text and seems more likely to be best understood as part of the *Itinerarium*'s attempt to celebrate virtues, specifically, the devotion of William to his lord, and later the devotion of Richard who arranges for William's release.[71] Other manifestations of this essential theme would surely be far less appealing to ecclesiastical sensibilities, such as the instances wherein clergymen and monastics are described as taking up arms and winning military glory, or where prominent churchmen are, in contrast to the role canon law prescribed for them, described as war leaders.[72]

Where the virtues of heroic crusaders are espoused, the *Itinerarium* often draws upon classical heroes in order to do so. James of Avesnes is described as 'a Nestor in counsel, an Achilles in arms, better than Attilius Regulus at keeping his word (*in fide*)',[73] while Richard receives his own catalogue of classical resemblances.[74] Even what could be perceived as the king's flaws were valourised by the IP2 author, 'If anyone perhaps may think that he could be accused of rash actions, you should know that he had an unconquerable spirit, could not bear insult or injury, and his innate noble spirit compelled him to seek his due rights'.[75]

Amongst the countless instances where the *Itinerarium* provides intricate details of battle, the text notes numerous memorable feats of arms, and on more than one occasion praises Muslim enemies for fighting *viriliter*, with Saladin at one point lamenting the loss of so many elite soldiers.[76] Displaying martial prowess and courage in the face of the enemy appears to be a serious concern for the actors of the *Itinerarium*, and more than one battle oration includes the notion that it is imperative for the crusaders to avoid accusations of cowardice. In a variation on the trope that victories make warriors boastful and impious, Richard I, in an oration at sea, decries his forces saying, 'Surely you're not going to let this ship get away

70 IP, p. 288. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 267.

71 IP, pp. 440–1, 380–1.

72 IP, pp. 32, 115–6. The issue of monks embarking on crusade became a more nuanced matter during the pontificate of Innocent III. See James A. Brundage, 'A Transformed Angel: The Problem of the Crusading Monk', in *Studies in Medieval Cistercian History Presented to Jeremiah F. O'Sullivan*, ed. by J. F. O'Callaghan (Spencer, MA, 1971), pp. 55–62.

73 IP, p. 65. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, pp. 74–5.

74 IP, p. 143.

75 IP, p. 143. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, pp. 145–6.

76 IP, pp. 208–9, 225–6. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, pp. 198–9, 214.

untouched? Shame on you! Are you turning into cowards, getting idle after so many triumphs?'[77]

However, this concern over cowardice, naturally important to an audience of lay nobility who understood bravery as part of proper aristocratic behaviour,[78] is not presented unambiguously. The desire to avoid shame, and the accusation of cowardice is central to another oration of the *Itinerarium* which, like that of the unnamed Frankish soldier, has an obvious didactic purpose. Described as taking place during the Battle of Arsuf, wherein the rear-guard of the army, headed by Knights Hospitaller suffered continual harassment from enemy archers, the inability of the warriors there to strike back provoked the Master of the Hospital to seek permission to conduct a charge. When this was refused, the knights were provoked to charge regardless, urged on by an impromptu oration:

> Why don't we give rein to our horses and charge them? Alas! Alas! We shall deserve to be criticised forever for being idle cowards. Did anyone ever before have anything like this happen to them? Never before have unbelievers inflicted such shame and dishonour on such a great army. Unless we quickly defend ourselves and charge them, we will have eternal disgrace. In fact, the longer we delay before acting the greater it will be.[79]

This exhortation, being concerned entirely with reputation, is in clear contrast to almost all other instances of crusading battle rhetoric of the twelfth century, as well as contemporary speeches. While at a certain level, a concern for reputation was acceptable, being deployed elsewhere in the battle rhetoric of the *Itinerarium*, the text makes clear the folly of the reckless charge this speech triggered. Though the encounter was ultimately a success, the breakdown in military command supposedly allowed many Turks to escape death.[80] So although a concern for the reputation of their order would have come naturally to members of the Knights Hospitaller[81]—indeed Ambroise has Gerard de Ridefort express that exact concern for the Templars when refusing to flee the battlefield where he would perish[82]—the *Itinerarium* presents the warriors of the Military Orders as sharing the same preoccupations of honour and reputation as the secular nobility. Crucially, the text explains that the two knights who supposedly were the first to break rank were the Marshal of the Hospital, a senior officer of significant responsibility, and an experienced

77 IP, p. 207. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 198.
78 Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, p. 253.
79 IP, p. 268. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 252.
80 IP, p. 268.
81 Helen Nicholson, *Templars, Hospitallers and Teutonic Knights: Images of the Military Orders, 1128–1291* (Leicester, 1993), pp. 102–4.
82 AM, i, pp. 48–9.

knight in the service of King Richard, Baldwin of Carew. A comparison of battle orations from Latin chronicles and the *Chanson de Roland* has highlighted how the avoidance of shame is a far more prominent theme of the latter.[83]

In thinking of their own reputation, those who conducted the impromptu charge at Arsuf contravened an established battle strategy, threatening the safety and unity of the crusader army which, as the text makes explicit, was a grievous sin.[84] While the *Itinerarum* thus seems perfectly willing to condemn excesses of 'knightly' behaviour perceived to be dangerous, it nevertheless devoted significant effort to praising the sort of bellicosity that was bound up with such behaviour. For example, in Richard's oration to his soldiers upon hurriedly reaching Jaffa, the king highlights both the quality of his soldiers, expressing his identification with them, over those of the enemy. This speech is prompted by a sense of obligation to fellow Christians, which the rear-guard at Arsuf were conversely criticized for disregarding:

> Well then, my excellent fellow knights who have shared everything with me, what should be done? Surely this cowardly rabble blockading the shore won't prevent us from landing? Or do we reckon that our lives are more valuable than the lives of those who are perishing in our absence? What is your opinion?[85]

The coda to this oration, which occurs when Richard is reassured that there are survivors still within Jaffa, references not only the likelihood of death, but also the belief that the crusaders were, through their actions, serving God. Yet despite this, and similarly regarding the story of William of Préaux, the focus of the rhetoric is on the willingness of the combatants to perish, although bereft of any promise of spiritual reward or sense of martyrdom. Indeed, Richard's final instruction to his soldiers is, 'death only to those who do not advance!'[86]

The didacticism of the *Itinerarium*, while in some ways recognizable in comparison with the explanatory framework common to earlier examples of crusading orations, is thus distinct for its focus on its mortal, albeit heroic, actors and their actions. This is forcefully conveyed in the speech of William, the Poitevin priest, who in no way presents any serious distinction between serving God, and the honour Richard has gained through numerous military triumphs, even when such triumphs were over other Christians.[87] The focus on military virtues and the prowess of Christian soldiery serves to

83 Bliese, 'Fighting Spirit and Literary Genre', pp. 422–3.

84 IP, pp. 268–9.

85 IP, p. 407. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 355.

86 IP, p. 407. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 355.

87 IP, pp. 361–4.

distinguish the *Itinerarium* from a number of earlier crusading narratives, particularly in terms of the form and function of its battle orations. This is also the case, to an extent, when comparing the rhetoric of the *Itinerarium* against contemporary crusading and non-crusading orations. Although produced in a similar time-frame, and likewise focusing upon the deeds of an individual monarch, the single oration found in William the Breton's portion of the *Gesta Philippi Augusti* contains no comparable invocation of the bravery or ability of Philip's soldiers.

In terms of comparison with another near contemporary crusading narrative, the anonymous *Libellus de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum* is accepted to have reached its final form around the year 1222. As is the case in regard to the *Itinerarium*, the *Libellus* existed in earlier draft likely produced during or shortly after the Third Crusade, and crucially it is this earlier period that the text's battle orations were most likely fashioned.[88] Indeed, in keeping with twelfth-century crusading battle rhetoric, where appeals to martial virtues appear in the rhetoric of the *Libellus*, such appeals are never advanced without religious reference. For example, in rallying men against an invasion force, a watchman of Nazareth is claimed to have cried; 'Men of Nazareth, take up arms, and fight bravely for the place of the true Nazarene'.[89] Likewise, Gerard de Ridefort praises the past victories of the Templars, yet the tradition of victory his soldiers are a part of is not defined by a *gens* or *natio* but one which has come down from the world of the Old Testament:

> My dearest brothers and fellow soldiers, you have always withstood these deceitful and fallen ones; you have exacted vengeance on them; you have always had victory over them. Therefore, gird yourselves, and stand firm in the Lord's battle, and remember your fathers, the Maccabees, whose duty of fighting for the Church, for the Law, [and] for the inheritance of the Crucified One you have now taken upon yourselves for a long time. But know that your fathers were victors everywhere not so much by numbers or in arms, as through faith, and justice, and observance of God's commands, since it is not difficult to triumph either with many [men] or few when victory is from heaven.[90]

Compared with the *Itinerarium*, the rhetoric of the *Libellus* is far less concerned with recording and celebrating military achievements. Not only is the

88 James Willoughby, 'A Templar Chronicle of the Third Crusade: Origin and Transmission', *Medium Aevum*, 81 (2012), pp. 126–34. Kane, 'Wolf's Hair', pp. 95–112. For recent commentary on the text of the *Libellus,* see LTS, pp. 1–107.

89 LTS, pp. 112–3.

90 LTS, pp. 114–5.

importance of faith the most significant element of Gerard's harangue, explicitly given primacy over issues such as numbers and equipment, Roger des Moulin's oration serves to deemphasize martial matters even further, delivering a speech which, as will be discussed later, is dominated by the notion of triumph over sin rather than triumph in battle.

Regarding direct martial rhetoric, the *Itinerarium* shares commonalities with narratives written around the time or soon after the Third Crusade that focus on the events of the early 1190s, rather than the calamities of the late-1180s. Just as ecclesiastical background of the IP2 author did not preclude his authorship of such anthropocentric orations, so too did Richard of Devizes see fit to place the heroism of Richard I and his forces centre-stage, to the marginalization of a more typical sense of divine direction. Infamous for his scepticism, Richard of Devizes seems to have had little interest in the idea of holy war against an Islamic enemy, providing only a brief and patchy account of the Third Crusade as it unfolded in the Holy Land. He instead devotes significant time to Richard's journey to the East and the fighting done along the way against Christians. The single oration of Richard's narrative, taking place on Sicily, is dominated entirely by notions of martial virtue, a long tradition of victory, a clear concern for reputation and very little religiosity, beginning:

> O my soldiers, the strength and crown of my realm! You who have endured a thousand perils with me,[91] you who by your bravery have conquered so many kinds and cities for me, do you not see that the cowardly mob is now insulting us? Will we not overcome Turks and Arabs, will we be the terror of the most invincible nations, will our right arms make a way for us to the ends of the earth after the Cross of Christ, will we restore the kingdom of Israel, if we show our backs to these vile and effeminate Griffons?[92]

Richard of Devizes was not the only author writing before the close of the twelfth century to craft his battle orations around Richard I's journey to the east, nor employ such speeches to chiefly highlight the military abilities of Richard and his soldiers. Both orations Roger of Howden included in his account of the Third Crusade, found in both his *Chronica* and the chronicle formerly attributed to Benedict of Peterborough, take place on the way to the Holy Land. Both accounts include an oration as part of the story of the disguised ship, also found in the *Itinerarium* although the content notably differs, as well as an oration delivered during Richard's attack upon Cyprus. In the two slightly divergent versions of this same speech, Roger, like

91 Book I, 299–300. James D. Duff (trans.), *The Civil War* (Cambridge, MA, 1928) pp. 24–5.
92 RD, p. 20.

Richard of Devizes, employs the language of Lucan's *Pharsalia* to rouse martial sentiment.[93]

Although Roger includes other significant appeals in his Cyprus orations, like Richard of Devizes, he was evidently not overly concerned with utilizing battle rhetoric in order to develop a clear ideology of crusading. Further points of correspondence between the orations of Richard of Devizes and Roger serve to highlight this point, such as the uncommon appeal of Richard's affection for his soldiers which both authors employ as a prompt to military engagement. In Richard of Devizes's oration, the king claims, 'I, your lord and king love you. I am solicitous of your good name, I tell you and I repeat that if by chance you go away from here without your revenges, the base repute of this flight will go ahead of you and accompany you'.[94] For his part, Roger of Howden claims Richard encouraged pursuit of an enemy vessel saying, 'Pursue them, and take hold: for if they depart, you will lose my love forever'.[95]

The *Itinerarium* is less interested in the development of a coherent crusading ideology through battle rhetoric in the fashion of *Lyxbonensi* or many First Crusade narratives, instead appearing content with celebrating the achievements and heroism of the crusaders as forcefully as possible within an already established narrative framework. In this sense, the *Itinerarium* is comparable to the *Expugnatio Hibernica* of Gerald of Wales, which was chiefly concerned with celebrating, as well as to an extent justifying and defending, the military efforts of Gerald's relatives and their followers in Ireland. Like the *Itinerarium* and Richard of Devizes's Sicily oration, martial virtues are a significant element of the battle rhetoric of the *Expugnatio*, with the first speech by a Cambro-Norman leader, Robert FitzStephen beginning:

> My comrades in other battles, picked fighting men, who have endured with me so many perils and have always displayed a spirit lofty and unconquered: if we consider carefully who we are, under what leader we serve, and with what a steady record of success we are entering upon this decisive struggle, we will win the day with our usual valour, and our good fortune in battle, with the favour she has shown of old, will not desert us.[96]

Moreover, there is a striking correspondence between the *Itinerarium* and the *Expugnatio* between how martial virtue, specifically courage, is presented

93 BP, ii, p. 163. RH, iii, p. 106. Book I, 349. Duff (trans.) *Civil War*, pp. 28–9. Richard of Devizes also includes another classical allusion in a brief call to arms made soon after his longer oration. RD, p. 23.

94 RD, p. 20.

95 RH, iii, p. 112.

96 EH, pp. 47–8.

in association with the notion of fortune. In a subsequent speech delivered by Gerald's uncle Maurice FitzGerald, the commander tells his soldiers that they have come to Ireland in order 'to make trial of the vicissitudes of Fortune and to test the strength of our valour at the risk of our lives'.[97] While the image of *Fortuna* and her wheel were well known to authors down to the end of the medieval period because of the influence of Boethius,[98] the notion of fortune was not common to battle rhetoric of the twelfth century, although authors such as Ralph of Caen attributed certain events to fortune in a manner that would have been unthinkable for writers such as Guibert of Nogent. Conversely, reference to fortune occurs throughout the *Expugnatio*,[99] and fortune is explicitly associated with courage and virtue by Maurice FitzGerald, whose oration contains the famous proverb: *audentes fortuna iuvat*.[100] Not only does the *Itinerarium* employ this same phrase in its description of Richard,[101] but the notion that Richard's virtue ensured he 'could not be overwhelmed by the hostile waves of life' is echoed in the *Itinerarium*'s final battle oration, where virtue is essential if one is to resist *fortunae procellas*.[102]

The deployment of notions of fortune in the *Itinerarium* is thus one way in which the narrative focuses upon the deeds of Richard and his crusaders. Although not a work lacking in religiosity in the manner of Richard of Devizes, the text nevertheless concedes a place to fortune in the course of determining events, particularly surrounding battle, which comparable works, such Ralph of Coggeshall's *Chronicon Anglicanum* and the *Libellus*, would attribute almost entirely to divine direction. The involvement of fortune in calls for martial virtue and courage in the *Itinerarium* is perhaps best understood as a product of the distance between the Third Crusade and the final phases of production. In the wake of 1187 and the spreading message of *Audita tremendi*, the notion of the divine direction of events, particularly in regard to tragedies meant to punish sin, was given renewed life. The *Expugnatio*, likely written while Gerald was in royal service between 1184 and 1189,[103] even seems to reflect this renewal. After recording the delegation of Patriarch Heraclius to Henry II, Gerald actually questions the notion of fortune entirely,[104] and relates the misfortunes that befell King Henry to God's punishment for his reluctance to commit to crusading.[105] That such ideas would resonate powerfully around the year 1187 seems

97 EH, p. 80–1.
98 Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History*, pp. 281–4.
99 EH, pp. 38–41, 46–9, 56–7, 80–1, 224–7.
100 EH, pp. 80–1.
101 IP, p. 143.
102 IP, p. 416–7.
103 EH, p. xv.
104 EH, p. 224–7.
105 EH, p. 201–7.

likely; however, for the *Itinerarium* to hold unwaveringly to a traditional explanatory historical framework of tragedy, repentance and victory so long after the Third Crusade, would serve to condemn the same men it sought to praise. While those writing closer to the campaign itself could maintain the sincerity of King Richard's commitment to return to the Holy Land and fulfil the expedition that had merely faltered rather than failed, after 1199 this was impossible.

Although not unique for it, the *Itinerarium* is to an extent distinguished from other crusading narratives by the way in which battle orations are employed to celebrate human rather than divine agency and valourize the heroes of the narrative. This priority was evidently maintained in spite of the challenges it posed to the traditional explanatory framework that prohibited the boastful celebration of heroic feats. As is evidenced by other important elements in the *Itinerarium*'s battle rhetoric, the IP2 author was by no means seeking to challenge this framework.

Gentes and nationes

The focus of the *Itinerarium* upon the military deeds and achievements of its heroes represents a break from the mould at least in regard to crusading orations. Thus, it could well be expected that the text would also buck the trend of battle rhetoric within a crusading context which, rather than often celebrating the achievements or abilities of particular *gentes* or *nationes,* almost entirely referred to crusaders collectively as Franks, whose defining characteristic was their faith. However, the *Itinerarium* seems similarly uninterested in utilizing battle rhetoric to exhort any particular *gens*, employing no such appeals at all.

As with earlier crusading narratives, this lack of appeals to *gentes* or *nationes* contrasts markedly with contemporary non-crusading narratives. While the *Itinerarium* and the *Expugnatio* both involve the practice of fighting and martial ability within an understanding of fortune, Gerald also explicitly relates the tradition of victory which the Anglo-Norman or Cambro-Norman actors of his narrative represent to their *gens*:

> In part we come from Trojan stock by direct line of descent. But we are also partly descended from the men of Gaul, and take our character in part from them. From the former we get our courage, from the latter our skill in the use of arms. So we are equally brave and versed in arms because of our twofold character and noble ancestry on both sides. Is there anyone who is not confident that this unarmed populace, this rabble of the common people, cannot resist us?[106]

106 EH, pp. 48–9.

The myth of Trojan ancestry was a common one in this period, with Rigord attributing the same lineage to the French.[107] French or Gallic ancestry seems to be of particular importance to Gerald, who not only attributes such descent to his own relatives, but also has an oration by the Irish King Ruardi include a demand for his people to emulate the Franks, despite no connection of descent.[108] Where the *Itinerarium* employs direct speech to discuss any kind of tradition of victory, as in the case of William the priest's oration to Richard, that tradition is not national or racial but personal, with the record of the king's success in battle being the dominant topic:

> Lord king, remember how much God has done for you. He has prospered your actions, so that they will be remembered for ever and ever. Never did a king of your age accomplish more glorious deeds than you have done. O king, recall how, when you were count of Poitou, you never had any neighbour of valour, any aggressive adversary, who was not subdued by your strength and surrendered to you. O king, remember the great struggles and disturbances cause by the Brabaçons, whom you routed and scattered so many times with a small force. O king, remember how gloriously you triumphed when you raised the siege at Hautefort, which the count of St. Gilles was besieging; and you drove him away, putting him shamelessly to flight … O king, remember your great deeds of valour, how many great nations you have subdued, how manfully you seized the city of Messina, how you showed prowess there when you restrained the Greek people who had dared to provoke and attack you. Recall, O king, the marks of virtue with which God endowed you, 'in the richness of his grace',[109] when you subjugated the island of Cyprus, which no one before you had ever dared to do, but which through God's help you were able to conquer in fifteen days, and you also captured the emperor … Remember, lord king, the siege of Acre, and how you arrived at the ideal time to capture it, and when you attacked it, it surrendered.[110]

In presenting Richard's victories as having been established by God rather than the efforts of ancestors or through any other fashion, this oration actually conforms more closely to many other crusading orations. Gerard de Ridefort in the *Libellus* deploys a similar notion, with the Maccabees serving as figurative 'forefathers' to the members of the Military Orders his oration

107 Henri-François Delaborde (ed), *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume Le Breton, historiens de Philippe-Auguste Chroniques de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton*, 2 vols (Paris, 1882–5), i, pp. 53–5.

108 EH, p. 44.

109 Ephesians 1:17.

110 IP, pp. 362–3. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, pp. 323–4.

is addressed to.[111] As is the case in regard to earlier twelfth-century crusading battle rhetoric, rhetorical appeals to *gentes* or *nationes* remain scarce.

However, while the rhetoric of the *Itinerarium* contains nothing comparable to the appeals to *gentes* found in the *Expugnatio Hibernica*, the broader narrative is not bereft of 'nationalistic' material. The most famous 'amazing story' relevant in this regard is perhaps the archery duel which took place between a Welshman and a Parthian named Grammahyr. While playing upon the supposed proficiency of both *gentes* with archery, the tale, which is likewise found in Ambroise, seems intended to amuse an English audience.[112] The narrative also comments pointedly upon the crusaders' enemies, more than once praising the Turks for their valour and effectiveness in battle.[113] Conversely, the narrative has little good to say about the French, delineated as the subjects of Philip II, who are noted for their idleness and sinful ways, providing foils to the pious and energetic crusaders the text attempts to present as *exempla*. The priest William contrasts Richard and Philip overtly, saying 'Remember, O king, this land which God has committed to your protection; it is your responsibility alone, because the king of France went away like a coward'.[114] The *Itinerarium*'s depiction of the French contingent, uniquely and perhaps not surprisingly, conforms closely with the 'camp vice' *topos*, which papal edicts and professional preachers of the early thirteenth century sought to combat,[115] including luxurious clothing and spending time idling in taverns and brothels: 'For although it was thought that their devotion had led them to come to the Holy Land on true pilgrimage, they had left the military life and indulged in the amatory life, with songs about women and bawdy feasting. According to eye-witness reports, they also delighted in dancing-girls'.[116]

Papal proclamation can perhaps illuminate why, given the common association of the rhetoric of martial virtue and ability with ideas of 'race' or 'nation' in works such as Gerald's *Expugnatio*, or the formulation of such appeals with religious reference, usually in terms of a 'chosen people', such appeals are entirely absent from the *Itinerarium*, as well as most rhetoric of the Third Crusade. The only exception to this trend is Richard of Devizes, who wrote at a time when the English reputation for which he displays such concern could still one day be supplemented by the success in the Holy

111 LTS, p. 114.

112 IP, pp. 108–9. AM, i, pp. 60–1. See also Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 111, n. 234. Brewer, *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*, p.lxii, n. 1.

113 IP, p. 228, 233, 234.

114 IP, p. 363. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 324

115 Ad liberendum and the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council had, by the time Richard de Templo was writing, most recently reissued the traditional prohibitions on extravagant dress. Ernest F. Henderson (ed. and trans.), *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages* (London, 1896), pp. 337–44.

116 IP, pp. 330–1. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 299.

Land. He in fact claimed Richard I tempted his men with this very notion.[117] After 1199, however, and certainly by the beginning of the third decade of the thirteenth century, it would be impossible to deny that God had not deigned to favour the English, nor any other *gens*, with a subsequent successful expedition. The continued vulnerability of the English reputation Richard of Devizes had written about, as well as to the standing of the 'Gauls', Spanish and Germans, is evident in the enemy mockery which papal works such as *Post miserabile* so forcefully depict.[118]

Material Reward

Rather than being best understood as providing revealing insight into the 'true' motivations of medieval warriors, previous chapters have argued that promises of and appeals to material wealth, particularly in crusading rhetoric, were not only rare but, where they were present, did not reflect any straightforward sense of narrow self-interest, rather were directly involved in a narrative's moral framework. Where there was a chance that the pursuit of plunder was antithetical to the unity and discipline of the crusader army, it was often identified and explicitly condemned by oration authors. The fact that seeking wealth or pursuing enemies for spoils or ransoms had, during the course of the First Crusade, often led to disaster forcefully demonstrated to medieval observers the flaws of greed and how such sin was punished. Outside of such didacticism, where appeals to wealth were deployed, they were almost always presented as 'God-given'—the just reward of fighting for the cause- or else employed to contrast with, and in an overtly inferior position to, earthly reward.

This trend, wherein appeals to material reward are both rare and often developed in a manner which serves the broader aims of the oration author, continued into the late-twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. While Ralph of Coggeshall and the author of the *Libellus* include no such appeals in their battle rhetoric, the authors of *Historia de expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* and the *Historia Peregrinorum* formulate such rhetoric in a familiar fashion. Delivered supposedly during the fighting around Iconium in 1190, the *Historia de expeditione* (traditionally ascribed to one Ansbert[119]) claims that: 'An imperial edict went out [Luke 2:1], that, if God granted victory to us, no one should be allowed to lay their hands on the spoils, until they had laid the enemy low to the earth and the city was brought under our control'.[120] The author of *Historia Peregrinorum*, posited to be a Cistercian of

117 RD, p. 20.
118 RH, iv, p. 71.
119 Graham A. Loud (trans.), *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa: The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick and Related Texts* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 2–3.
120 HEF, p. 84.

Salmansweiler, who wrote around the very end of the twelfth century,[121] extends the rhetoric of the *Historia de expeditione* in this regard. In an oration delivered by Frederick Barbarossa to his son the Duke of Swabia, the emperor concludes:

> I decree this to everyone generally, that no one before the conclusion of a battle should seek to grasp at plunder, nobody should lift up his fallen friend, but trampling him should pass over him in order to fight the enemy manfully. He who has the help of food should share it with someone not having any. For tomorrow, whatever happens to us, we shall all be enriched, since either triumphing over the enemy we will be filled with their spoils and the food of those enemies or, dying for Christ we should enjoy with him the abundance of celestial goods.[122]

Although increasingly sophisticated crusade preparation helped to alleviate the problems of supply upon crusade expeditions, the *Itinerarium* for example describing Byzantine Greeks as having no fear of the German army because the soldiers were well provisioned,[123] the problems posed by sinful greed, by which both soldiers and lords might be motivated to act discordantly from their fellows, was still well recognized in the late-twelfth and early thirteenth century. The rules of the expedition, agreed between Richard and Philip, prescribed the equal division of spoils between the kings, in an attempt to guard against such disharmony.[124] Moreover, encyclicals such as *Audita tremendi* and *Post miserabile*, by expanding the sphere of contribution to crusading efforts beyond actual physical participation to include the donation of money, served to highlight how a concern for wealth could hinder the recovery of Jerusalem:

> Work for the recovery of that land in which for our salvation Truth has arisen from the land and did not disdain to carry the forked wood of the cross for us. Pay attention not to earthly profit and glory, but to the will of God who himself taught us to lay down our souls for our brothers. Give your riches to him, which whether willingly or unwillingly, you do not know to which greedy heirs they will be left.[125]

This was one way in which the moral and spiritual reform of Christendom which preoccupied the papacy of Innocent III and beyond

121 HP, p. lxxxvi.
122 HP, p. 168.
123 IP, pp. 44–6.
124 Gillingham, *Richard the Lionheart*, pp. 142–5.
125 Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges*, p. 9. Bird, Peters and Powell, *Crusade and Christendom*, pp. 7–8.

was inextricably bound to the success, or lack thereof, of the crusading movement.

Given that greed continued to be the subject of condemnation from both papal proclamation and crusading preaching, it is notable that the rhetoric of the *Itinerarium* resists the pattern of material appeals presented by earlier crusading rhetoric. In relating the challenges of the siege of Acre the *Itinerarium* relates:

> The king considered the difficulties which they had encountered; how warlike their enemies were, and that courage is needed at critical junctures. He decided that the best way to arouse enthusiasm in the young was to offer a reward rather than to force them by commands, because everyone is attracted to the smell of money.[126]

This promise of material wealth, meant to stir courage for an attack attempting to demolish some of the city's defences, is noted for its success. The text claims that: 'You would have seen youths leap forward, and men-at-arms of great valour rush to the wall and eagerly keep on pulling out stones, as greedy for glory as for gain'.[127] That the acquisition of wealth is presented as a motivator for soldiers in such a way, without any religious reinforcement or a direct rejection of greed, is striking. However, while it is unusual in its divergence from the norm, it is perhaps easy to overestimate the significance of this story. Wealth does not feature as a motivation appeal anywhere else in the *Itinerarium*; in fact the IP2 author, in providing Richard I with a speech during the story of the disguised ship, which is not included in Ambroise, actually removes the appeal to material wealth found in both versions of the speech crafted by Roger of Howden.[128] Moreover, the *Itinerarium* describes instances where the taking of plunder was prohibited,[129] and elsewhere makes clear that greed, particularly during periods of deprivation for the crusader army, was a crime which God would certainly correct.[130] In this regard, there is a divide between Book I and the remainder of the *Itinerarium*, as Book I contains a recognizable story of poor motivations, specifically seeking after wealth and glory, as the cause of a defeat on 25 July 1190.[131]

Although avarice would be an accusation increasingly levelled at crusading following 1204, and remained a favourite topic of crusade preaching,[132] the *Itinerarium* displays none of the defensiveness over

126 IP, p. 255. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 214.
127 IP, pp. 225–6. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 214.
128 BP, ii, p. 163. RH, iii, p. 112.
129 IP, pp. 47–9.
130 See for example the story of the Pisian grain hoarder. IP, pp. 136–7.
131 IP, pp. 89–90.
132 Bird, 'The Victorines, Peter the Chanter's Circle, and the Crusade', p. 25.

material reward appeals found in the orations of works such as the *Expugnatio Hibernica* which make clear the just cause, and thus just reward, being fought for. The same speech also stresses that it is a desire for land for their people and children that drives the Cambro-Normans, and expresses the superiority of glory and fame over wealth.[133] Centrally, the understanding of wealth and material reward in the *Itinerarium* seems geared towards celebrating the largess of Richard I. Richard not only offers wealth as a spur towards courageous action, he is also on numerous occasions described as giving generous gifts to knights and lords,[134] even going so far as to lend money to vassals of his rival Philip Augustus so that French soldiers could be paid their due wages.[135] While perhaps unusual for a crusade narrative, the manner in which the *Itinerarium* presents its central hero as a generous benefactor, concerned with the wages of his soldiers is far from unique, in many ways mirroring the depiction of Tancred in Ralph of Caen's *Gesta Tancredi*. As is evidently also the case in the writings of Roger of Howden, the traditional caution of greed and care when employing appeals to material wealth, was less important to the IP2 author than displaying Richard's fiscal as well as military virtues.

Divine Aid

As has been argued earlier, the orations of the *Itinerarium*'s first book do much to establish its account within an explanatory framework typical of crusading narratives of the twelfth century. Moreover, the subsequent books of the narrative echo earlier texts, such as pointing to the agency of God in preventing an enemy ship from coming to the relief of the defenders of Acre, allowing a favourable wind for the swift journey to Jaffa, or protecting King Richard in battle.[136] However, while far from irreligious, the battle orations of the *Itinerarium*, especially after Book I, contain almost no material concerned with divine aid or support in battle. This is notable given the nature of the expedition, as well as the prominence of such appeals in earlier crusading battle rhetoric. Even non-crusading orations sometimes contained highly detailed and expansive appeals to heavenly assistance. That nothing in the *Itinerarium*'s battle rhetoric comes close to earlier orations in terms of divine aid is certainly striking, yet it is not altogether unique. No such appeals are found in the rhetoric of Richard of Devizes, who actually concludes his narrative with a lament, given by Richard I in direct speech on the subject of God's lack of support for his crusade.[137]

133 EH, pp. 48–9.
134 IP, pp. 171–2, 240.
135 IP, p. 239.
136 IP, pp. 208–9, 405, 422.
137 RD, p. 82.

This absence, as well as a broader trend against appeals to divine aid in crusading battle rhetoric in this period, is best understood as the result of two distinct factors. In the first place, as has already been discussed, the centring of narratives on the actions of Richard I was evidently a high priority for certain authors, including the IP2 author and Richard of Devizes, and concordantly to the focus on the king and his crusaders is the comparatively diminished position of the divine. This seems to an extent to also be the case in the *Chronica* of Roger of Howden, who provides Richard with an oration that demands faith in God to give victory, but nevertheless seems more concerned with the actions of the crusaders:

> The king therefore hearing that the evil emperor would do nothing for him, except by force, ordered all of the army to take up their weapons, and so armed to follow him. And he said to them; 'Follow me, and let us punish the wrongs which that emperor treacherous to God and to us has done, who against the judgement and justice of God holds our pilgrims in bonds. And do not fear them because they are unarmed, ready for flight rather than war, but we are well armed, and he who denies what is just gives up everything to an enemy under arms. And it is necessary to fight manfully for the liberation of the people of God from perdition; knowing that we either must win or die. But I have definite faith in God, that he will give victory to us today over this faithless emperor and over his people'.[138]

It is also noteworthy that this oration juxtaposes victory or death, rather than physical victory or spiritual victory.

Where the interest of chroniclers seems further removed from the valourization of crusaders, particularly Richard I, there is also often to be found a greater focus on divine agency and divine aid in battle rhetoric. In the account of the Third Crusade from his *Chronicon Anglicanum*, Ralph of Coggeshall includes two orations which take place during the fighting at Jaffa. Unlike the given instances, divine aid is essential to both orations and the notion of *Dei auxilium* appears repeatedly. Describing the first of the two speeches, both of which delivered by Richard I, Ralph wrote:

> And so that he could enliven his army for the coming battle and make it braver, he told them how much the Lord had done for them in the city, and of how so few triumphed over so many enemies. 'Therefore, O knights of Christ, let us invoke', he said 'the help of Almighty God, so that by his potent virtue he may destroy today our enemies Make sure that in the first skirmish that you will resist them unanimously (*unanimiter*), and that you endure manfully the first assault of that

138 RH, iii, pp. 106–7.

> attack, so that they cannot disperse our formation, first penetrating amongst us, and so they don't enclose us, like a few little sheep inside the sheepfold, and hack us to pieces with blows. For if having been scattered we are able to bear the first assault of their attack, we shall weigh at nothing their audacity and with God's help we will triumph victoriously over the enemies of the cross of Christ …'[139]

The German evidence also provides other examples of rhetoric where assistance from heaven proves central, with both the imperial edict issued by Frederick I and the oration of the recently released knight Godfrey found in *Historia de expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* referencing God-given victory.[140]

However, these instances can nevertheless be situated in a broader trend against such appeals, which merits further discussion. As well as including several appeals to divine aid in his first of two orations at Jaffa, Ralph of Coggeshall nevertheless uses direct speech to impart also close details of the fighting being described, and goes to the effort to refocus on and delineate the character of his speaker, Richard I, in the conclusion of his first oration, writing; 'But if I shall see any of you gesturing from fear, and providing a place within us for the enemy or if I see anyone fleeing somewhere I swear by Almighty God, that with a swift blow I will cut off his head'.[141] Moreover, the second oration Ralph provides to Richard contains no appeals to divine aid at all. In a similar vein, although *Historia de expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* deploys the notion of God-given victory, the *Historia Peregrinorum* does not, in spite of its otherwise heavy reliance on the earlier text.

Beyond a focus on individual or collective human heroics, this broader trend is accountable at least in part to the ultimate failure of the 1189–1192 campaigns, as well as the continued lack of significant successes in the Holy Land in the early thirteenth century. If one surveys the late-twelfth and early thirteenth century crusading rhetoric broadly in comparison with earlier orations, not only are appeals to divine aid less frequent, they are also less developed and less 'spectacular'.[142]

Given that defeat was traditionally rationalized as the judgement of God because of sin, which demanded repentance, the downward trend of appeals to divine aid is not difficult to comprehend. Moreover, a lack of success had serious moral implications on the part of participants and challenged the

139 RC, pp. 46–7.

140 HEF, pp. 84–5.

141 RC, p. 46. For the historiographical construction of Richard's anger see Stephen J. Spencer, 'Like a Raging Lion': Richard the Lionheart's Anger during the Third Crusade in Medieval and Modern Historiography', *The English Historical Review*, 132 (2017), pp. 495–532.

142 Staunton, *Historians of Angevin England*, p. 238.

framework of orations such as that of the priest Raol in *Lyxbonensi*, whose speech includes a brief promise of supernatural protection but subsequently dwells extensively on the behaviour and mindset required of soldiers to be worthy of such protection. The uncoupling of victory from moral and spiritual reform in this way was no doubt jarring to many crusade commentators, as well as to an early thirteenth century papacy which endeavoured continually to advance both simultaneously. However, there is very little of the penitential or devotional rhetoric of earlier crusading orations in the *Itinerarium*, or the speeches of Roger of Howden and Richard of Devizes. Where such material is treated at length by battle rhetoric, it is formulated in a way that attempted to directly challenge this very issue. In crafting sequential speeches for the Master of the Templars and the Master of the Hospitallers, the author of *Libellus* delivers a clear two-part message. The oration of Gerard de Ridefort, although containing no direct divine aid appeals, maintains the traditional explanatory framework of victory being consequent upon faith in God, rather than military proficiency, numbers etc. However, the speech of Roger des Moulins then proceeds to nuance this understanding of divinely directed events:

> Dearest brothers, and friends always, do not be afraid of these growling dogs who flourish today [but] will tomorrow be cast into a pool of fire and brimstone. You, however, are a chosen generation, a holy nation, a purchased people. You are eternal, because you are going to reign with the Eternal One. Therefore, do not fear or tremble, but remember Abraham, who pursued and struck down the four kings with 300 servants, and seized the spoils. Melchizedek, king of Salem, came to meet him as he was returning from the slaughter of the four kings, offering bread and wine, and gave a blessing. Look: having overcome the four capital vices in the power of the Trinity, the king of Salem, namely the King of Justice, the true priest Jesus Christ, will come to meet you too, offering the bread of eternal satiety and the wine of perpetual redemption. Furthermore, he will pour out [his] blessing so that you may no longer be enslaved by the pleasures of the flesh.[143]

Rather than being filled with assurances of victory in the immediate future, Roger's oration attempts to raise morale in a fashion which relies upon a greater chronological scope, arguing that there is no reason to fear the enemy on the day of the battle, because their success at that time will not alter their assured future damnation. The essence of this oration is that of spiritual victory over sin, *panem satietatis æternæ* and *vinum redemptionis perpetuæ*, which regarding the situation in the Holy Land would no doubt be

143 LTS, pp. 114–7.

a more palatable notion than that of divinely directed and supported victory, especially in the wake of the collapse of the Fifth Crusade.

As well as the lack of success in the Holy Land, the understanding and deployment of appeals to divine aid, like notions of repentance, righteous intention and good behaviour in the early thirteenth century were no doubt influenced by the form of indulgence first spread by Bernard of Clairvaux and Eugenius III. This formulation was established as standard by Innocent III prior to the Fourth Crusade, which will be discussed later.

The Cross

Previous chapters have displayed how appeals to the cross of Christ deployed in crusading battle rhetoric of the early and mid-twelfth century were formulated in varying fashions, reflecting the multifaceted nature of such a potent symbol. Chapter Four argued that, while still a symbol of victory, a *vexillum*, Raol's oration at the climax of *Lyxbonensi*, ultimately stresses the salvific, penitential nature of the cross 'taken' in imitation of Christ, rather than its nature as an emblem of war or protective talisman. This is in spite of contemporary Cistercian preaching around the Second Crusade, which sought to disentangle the cross from the notion of *imitatio Christi*.

However, the efforts of the Cistercians around the mid-twelfth century highlight how the crusading badge and ideas of Christo-mimesis were not necessarily inextricably conjoined elements of crusading spirituality.[144] That a distinct coherent ideology and practice of crusading, as well as a widespread understanding of how it was delineated from pilgrimage and earlier sanctified conflicts, did not come about until the end of the twelfth and early in the thirteenth century, has been forcefully argued by Tyerman. Typological ambiguity in regard to the practices of holy war, just war and pilgrimage, which were brought together by Urban, utilizing the cross to bridge a conceptual chasm, is perhaps reflected in the symbol's multifaceted nature in early crusading battle rhetoric. Moreover, an examination of charter evidence from 1095 implies that Urban's revolutionary association of the symbol of the cross with the crusader's pilgrimage vow was not immediately understood in a widespread fashion. The adoption of the cross onto clothing as preparation for armed pilgrimage evidently took time to be comprehended, as charter writers still felt the need to explain the practice into the third and fourth decades of the twelfth century.[145]

According to Tyerman, almost all such ambiguity was swept away by the devastation wrought by Saladin in 1187, and the eventual coherent ideology of crusading that would emerge following this catastrophe would centre on

144 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, p. 183. Cf. Norman Housley, *Contesting the Crusades* (Oxford, 2006), p. 20.

145 Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 11. Kane, 'Impact of the Cross', pp. 100–1.

the cross as a universal symbol of redemption, which brought to mind the Passion, and enduring military loyalty to Christ.[146] Certainly, it has been argued at length elsewhere how the loss of two of the most significant relics of the Passion, the True Cross and the Holy Sepulchre, was sufficiently distressing to Western audiences as to provoke a response of such scale as no crusading endeavour had ever utilized since Clermont.[147] The image of the cross was also central to the ecclesiastical response to Hattin, with its loss being related in Gregory VIII's encyclical *Audita tremendi*.[148]

The ubiquity of the image of the cross following 1187 is naturally reflected in many examples of near contemporary battle rhetoric. While largely bereft of spiritual motivational appeals, the oration given by Richard I in Richard of Devizes account of the king's time in Sicily references the cross in a fashion which places it at the heart of the undertaking:

> Will we overcome Turks and Arabs, will we be the terror of the most invincible nations, will our right arms make a way for us to the ends of the earth after the Cross of Christ, will we restore the kingdom of Israel, if we show our backs to these vile and effeminate Griffons?[149]

However, chronological proximity far from correlates with the frequency or development of cross appeals. In fact, while Richard of Devizes employs the imagery of the cross, it is totally absent from battle orations found in the accounts of Roger of Howden as well as the *Historia* of 'Ansbert'. Moreover, where later accounts make mention of the cross it is not always in a significant fashion. Ralph of Coggeshall only briefly references *inimicis crucis Christi*. However, there are examples of authors who do present such appeals in an extended or important fashion. The author of the *Historia Peregrinorum* adds such an appeal to an oration at Iconium, despite there being no mention of the cross in Ansbert's version of the same events. In the *Historia*'s second of two orations, delivered by Frederick Duke of Swabia during a dangerous encounter outside of the walls of Iconium, the cross is not an emblem of victory or a sign of protection, but an affirmation of the crusader vow and of salvation:

> O vigorous men, whose boldness and courage through many crises of war has until now shone sufficiently, why now, to the shame of the Holy Cross and the shame of your pilgrimage, as if you were inferiors and

146 Tyerman, 'Were There Any Crusades in the Twelfth Century', p. 574.

147 See Colin Morris, *The Sepulchre of Christ and the Medieval West: From the Beginning to 1600* (Oxford, 2005). Deborah Gerish, 'The True Cross and the Kings of Jerusalem', *Haskins Society Journal*, 8 (1996), pp. 137–55.

148 Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges*, p. 7.

149 RD, p. 20.

> frightened men, do you so avoiding the war in front of you flee into destruction, since behind, a greater mass of enemies is ready to take those fleeing? Nowhere is flight available; therefore, it is necessary that your strength should be your refuge; here you must rely on all your strength. Come! Excellent knights, quickly return to the fight and let the memory of that day, when you assumed the sign of the salvation giving (*salutifere*) cross, embolden your courage.[150]

Frederick's injunction that his soldiers remember their adoption of the 'salvation giving' cross recalls not only the description of the crusader badge by Nicholas of Clairvaux as *signum salutis*,[151] but also Christ's assumption of the *sanctae crucis*.

The zenith of ecclesiastical and lay attention on the cross in the wake of 1187 included a perhaps renewed focus on the horrors and suffering of the Passion and Crucifixion. In the *Passio Reginaldi* of Peter of Blois, Peter wrote: 'As elephants are roused to battle by the sight of blood, so, and more fervently, does the sight of the Holy Cross and the remembrance of the Lord's Passion rouse Christian knights'.[152] For another French theologian in the papal curia in 1187, Henri de Marcy, who was actively involved in the preaching of the Third Crusade, the loss of the Cross was not only a powerful reminder of the Crucifixion, it was a re-enactment of it. In language strongly reminiscent of the battle oration Baldric of Bourgueil places in his account at the siege of Jerusalem, Henri wrote in a letter of 1188: 'For why would [God] permit the wood of the Cross to be carried off by heathens if not to be crucified by them again?'[153]

Important to the writings and preaching of both Peter and Henri was the notion that travelling East to recover the Cross and the Sepulchre served as a self-imposed spiritual crucifixion, hardships undertaken for Christ.[154] This notion echoes much of the penitential and devotional material common to First Crusade battle rhetoric, as well as to the ideology of crusading advanced in *Lyxbonensi*, in spite of the alternate theology of the cross championed by Bernard of Clairvaux; however, in the case of Third Crusade battle rhetoric the influence of such notions is questionable.

It is not in any particularly devotional sense that the *Itinerarium* employed

150 HP, p. 169.

151 'Nicholai Claræ-Vallensis in persona S. Bernardi – Epistola CDLXVII (1125)'. in *Sancti Bernardi Abbatis Primi Claræ-vallensis et Opera Omnia, PL*, 182, vol 2, 672. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, p. 23.

152 '*Passio Reginaldi principis Antiocheni*' in *Petri Blesensis Bathoniensis in Anglia Archdiaconi Opera Omnia*, *PL*, 207, 974. Tyerman, 'Were there any crusades', p. 574.

153 'Domni Henrici Clarævallensis quondam Abbatis Postmodum Albanensis Episcopi Epistolæ', in *Clementis III Pontificis Romani Epistolæ Et Privilegia: Ordine Chronologico Digesta, PL*, 204, 250. Kane, 'Impact of the Cross', p. 106. BB, p. 108.

154 Kane, 'Impact of the Cross', pp. 107–8.

the idea of the cross or discussed the lost True Cross. IP1 characterizes the endeavour, which Richard I is first to undertake, as being 'for the sake of avenging the injury of the Cross',[155] a sentiment also applied to others who answered the collapse of the kingdom of Jerusalem.[156] Moreover, the cross never figures in the hortatory content of the *Itinerarium*'s battle rhetoric, and strikingly in contrast to earlier crusading appeals, where the cross figures far more often than the Holy Sepulchre, the *Itinerarium* records that the rallying war cry of Richard I during the Battle of Arsuf was: 'God and the Holy Sepulchre, help us!'[157]

Beyond describing Richard's vow, the only time the narrative dwells on the cross beyond Book I is in describing the attempts at negotiating for the release of the True Cross.[158] As this chapter has already argued, the rhetoric of the *Itinerarium*, particularly beyond Book I is little concerned with the same kind of didactic devotional material which dominates earlier crusading rhetoric. That the lack of cross appeals in its orations simply conforms with this trend seems straightforward; however, the picture is complicated by comparison with the orations of the *Libellus*, which despite being highly concerned with a battle that ultimately advances a call for spiritual reform in the face of disaster, is likewise bereft of reference to the cross. Outside of the context of the Holy Land, the crusading battle rhetoric of the Albigensian Crusade, penned in the second decade of the thirteenth century by Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay, is also devoid of appeals to the cross.[159] Such absences are difficult to account for, even accepting that authors such as Roger of Howden and the IP2 author were less concerned than other authors in utilizing battle rhetoric in order to construct and project a clear crusade ideology. This seems particularly problematic in the context of post-1187 crusading wherein preaching on the cross became increasingly associated with holy war.[160]

An explanation of this trend is to be found in the reformulated indulgence of Innocent III, issued in 1198, which echoed the work of Bernard of Clairvaux and Eugenius III. Rather than the indulgence being a simple declaration that the undertaken endeavour would be accepted as sufficient penance, it became a guarantee of remission of sin on God's behalf, given in mercy as reward for the devout performance of meritorious action.[161] The appeal and impact of this new formulation was commented upon by Geoffrey of Villhardouin, who saw it as crucial to the mobilization of so

155 Mayer, *Das Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, p. 276.
156 IP, p. 59.
157 IP, p. 274.
158 IP, pp. 231–41.
159 Guébin and Lyon, *Historia Albigensis,* i, p. 268, ii, p. 152.
160 Kienzle, 'Preaching the Cross', p. 20.
161 Riley-Smith, *Crusades*, p. 121.

many of those who would eventually take part in the Fourth Crusade.[162] The generosity of the indulgence no doubt related to the shift in emphasis from the actions and behaviour of crusaders, whose sin could likely never be outweighed by penance, to the mercy of God. Of course, crusading preaching and crusade encyclicals could continue to deploy the cross rhetoric of Urban, with *Quia maior* for example employing the language of Matthew 16:24,[163] and demanding that crusaders embrace virtue and avoid sin.[164] However, this was not the same kind of quasi-monastic *conversio* which the battle rhetoric of First Crusade narratives often present as essential to the ideology of the armed pilgrimage of 1099, which was usually expressed through the shorthand of the cross, in the manner of Urban II. Moreover, while thirteenth-century preaching such as that of Jacques de Vitry still characterized the cross as a burden, in a fashion similar to how it was described by the author of IP1,[165] the perceived nature of that burden had seemingly changed between the end of the twelfth and the second decade of the thirteenth century. *Ad liberandam* of 1215 even goes so far as to tacitly accept that sinful behaviour upon crusade expeditions was inevitable, setting out how it might be remedied through proper ministering by priests, repentance, and by the power conferred upon SS Peter and Paul of 'binding and loosing'.[166] While such provisions no doubt reflect a much broader attempt at fashioning a defined institution of crusading, such measures distinguish crusading markedly from the 'new path to salvation' undertaken by a reformed sanctified knighthood written about by men such as Guibert of Nogent, and in reference to the Military Orders by Bernard of Clairvaux,[167] the former of which made clear the direct link between the spiritual battles of penitents with the (subordinate) physical battles they faced, bringing such matters to the fore, narratively speaking, through direct speech.[168]

Seemingly, in the early thirteenth century, the cross largely ceased to be deployed in battle rhetoric as a powerful signifier of a complex range of interconnected notions of penitential pilgrimage, *imitatio Christi*, as well as the *caritas* which demanded violent action on behalf of injured or threatened *socii* (which included not only fellow crusaders, alongside whom in

162 Edmond Faral (ed. and trans), *La conquête de Constantinople*, by Geoffrey of Villehardouin, 2 vols (Paris, 1961), i, p. 4.

163 'Innocentii III Romani Pontificus Regestorum Sive Epistolarum Liber XVI. XXVIII universis christi fidelibus per maguntinensem provinciam constitutes. De negotio terræ sanctæ –' *Innocentii III Opera Omnia, PL*, 216, vol 3, 817.

164 Bird, 'The Victorines, Peter the Chanter's Circle, and the Crusade', pp. 25–8.

165 Mayer, *Das Itinerarium Peregrinorum,* p. 277.

166 Henderson, *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, p. 344.

167 Daniel O' Donovan, *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux: Treatises III: On Grace and Free Choice. In Praise of the New Knighthood* (Kalamazoo, MI, 1977), pp. 132–4.

168 GN, pp. 112–3.

particular single-minded unity in the fashion of the *ecclesia primitiva* was often demanded) but also Christ and the cross itself. Such appeals instead gave way to motivational tropes which reflected military loyalty to Christ, such as vengeance for Christ, or spiritual rewards for service even unto death that no longer required explicit invocation alongside the symbol the *crucesignatus* had been signed with. Even the previously common designator *miles/milites Christi*, which reflected the penitential and monastic spirituality that informed so much twelfth-century crusading battle rhetoric, finds little use in orations of the Third Crusade. It is to be found in only one oration by Ralph of Coggeshall. Likewise, Ralph is the only author of this period to employ the language of unity reminiscent of the *ecclesia primitiva*, and common to First Crusade orations, in his battle rhetoric.[169]

Vengeance and Justice

In Chapters Two and Three, it was demonstrated that the battle rhetoric of First Crusade narratives employed few references to the sort of military or legal conventions believed to make a particular military undertaking just or unjust, such as those which partisan writers like William of Poitiers referenced in the service of their political patrons.[170] Rather, notions of justice and vengeance, where they were employed by authors, were largely utilized in order to highlight the proper behaviour and righteous intention of the earliest crusaders, whose actions were just because they were performed in order to correct, or avenge injustice and sin. Subsequently, Chapter Four displayed the increasing prominence in the number and varying forms of appeals to ideas of justice, coinciding with the completion and spread of Gratian's *Decretum*, which was evidently utilized by several oration authors. As with Gratian's theories of just war, the appeals to justice found in texts produced after the 1140s did not represent a sharp break with those of earlier crusading and non-crusading appeals, but a development of certain key ideas centrally concerned with authority, righteous behaviour, intention and sin. As well as being drawn upon by the author of *Lyxbonensi,* these advances in canon law were reflected in appeals to justice and authority, in both a civil and ecclesiastical sense, in many non-crusading twelfth-century battle orations, reflecting what was no doubt a heightened awareness of such notions by ecclesiastical and secular elites.

It is therefore unsurprising that such appeals continue to be found in the

169 RC, p. 46–8. Although Roger of Howden does employ the term *unanimiter* in describing the attacking upon the disguised ship, RH, iii, p. 112.

170 WP, p. 108.

battle rhetoric of non-crusading sources after 1187 and into the thirteenth century. Given the aims of Gerald of Wales in producing his *Expugnatio Hibernica*, chiefly to justify the English crown's control of Ireland,[171] as well as the role of his own relatives in its conquest, such appeals would naturally seem appropriate. However, it is not the case that Gerald wrote as a simple partisan, but in pursuing dramatic verisimilitude employs his orations in a fashion which wrestles seriously with issues of justice. To the Irish king Ruaidrí, Gerald attributes an oration where the opponent of his relatives describes his soldiers as guardians of country and liberty (*patrie tutores et libertatis*), opposing those who would bring ruinous civil strife to Ireland. Moreover, his oration concludes with an appeal to the defence of *patria* and *libertas.*[172] Of course, the Cambro-Normans and their Irish allies are permitted to retort in their own orations, which not only challenge Ruaidrí's authority as a king, but accuse him of unjust misrule which the invaders are simply seeking to correct.[173] As is the case in earlier orations, conventions of legality and authority were seldom distinguished in battle rhetoric from concerns of behaviour and intention, whether in a crusading or non-crusading context. The speech by Diarmait Mac Murchada not only dismisses Ruaidrí's claim on Leinster, but also argues:

> For wars are won not with abundance of men or military forces, but of virtues. So, humility will fight for us against arrogance, right and justice against injustice, modesty and restraint against arrogance and licence. Men win victories because they have many virtues, not because they have countless forces at their disposal. Justice and the laws allow us to repel an injustice imposed by force of arms by having recourse to the remedy of armed conflict. Our cause – a fight for our country and our inheritance- is in our favour. They are fighting for gain, while we are struggling to avoid destruction.[174]

Such rhetoric only forms a small part of Gerald's broader moralization of the invasion of Ireland, in which the influence of the ideals of the crusading movement are apparent not only in the description of the delegation of Heraclius, but in the language employed by Gerald in commenting on the condition of the Irish Church; 'Just as the flesh is always at war with the spirit, so those who serve the flesh oppose those who serve the spirit, and

171 On Gerald's purposes and his use of inserted documents, including the letter of Adrian VI *Laudabiliter*, see Ann J. Duggan, 'The Making of a Myth: Giraldus Cambrensis, *Laudabiliter*, and Henry II's Lordship of Ireland' in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, ed. by Joel T. Rosenthal and Paul E. Szarmach, Third Series, 4 (2007), pp. 107–70.

172 EH, pp. 42–5.

173 EH, pp. 46–9.

174 EH, pp. 46–7.

the minions of Caesar wage war with unceasing malevolence against the soldiers of Christ'.[175]

Into the thirteenth century, appeals to recognizable just causes for violence continue to appear in non-crusading orations. William the Breton's speech delivered by Philip Augustus at Bouvines is concerned centrally with the defence of the Church, whose ministers and property have been mistreated by their opponents. Compared with other non-crusading orations of both the twelfth and early thirteenth century William's oration at Bovines stands out for its religiosity. In it, Philip argues that not only are his men fighting for a worthy cause, but that they are sinners who in fighting in the service of God and the Church submit themselves to such authorities.[176] Such rhetoric seems indicative of an age when the championing of the crusading movement was, largely through extensive papal activity, aligned closely with broader initiatives aimed at reform on a spiritual and institutional level. Moreover, the continual development of canon law in the late-twelfth and early thirteenth century by the so-called Decretalists would see crusading and violence in the defence of religion both categorized as forms of holy war, which was itself a particular type of sacred, as opposed to profane, war, equivalent to the defence of the realm or the defence of oneself and others.[177] In a sense then, the fighting at Bouvines was justified along the same lines as the violence conducted by Richard I on Sicily, according to Richard of Devizes, who depicted a brief call to arms wherein Richard roused his men to fight by claiming one of his leading men was under attack by the despised Griffons.[178] Likewise, Roger of Howden depicts Richard I during his encounter against the forces of Byzantine claimant Isaac Comnenus as being concerned with the protection and liberation of his fellows.[179]

In a manner in keeping with First Crusade battle rhetoric, neither the *Historia de Expeditione Friderici* nor the *Historia Peregrinorum* include appeals to justice beyond reference to the nature of their undertaking of service to God or Christ.[180] However, far more common to Third Crusade battle rhetoric than those appeals which sought to present fighting as just by reference to authority, righteous intention or a cause such as defence, were appeals to vengeance. Almost all of the non-German Third Crusade accounts, this chapter considers deploy an appeal to vengeance at least once in their battle rhetoric.

The prevalence of such appeals seems attributable to two chief factors.

175 EH, pp. 198–9.
176 Delaborde, *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume Le Breton*, i, p. 273.
177 Brundage, 'The Hierarchy of Violence', pp. 670–92.
178 RD, p. 23.
179 RH, iii, pp. 106–7.
180 HEF, p. 84. HP, pp. 168–9.

The first is the fallout of the events of 1187. While earlier orations deployed appeals to vengeance that were often rooted in social obligations, even utilizing familial language in order to craft appeals to defend the 'mother' Church or God the 'father', 1187 brought an impetus for vengeance for the death of Eastern Christians, the loss of the Holy Cross, Jerusalem and the Holy Land, and most importantly vengeance for the injury done to Christ and the Cross.[181] This idea was not a post 1187 invention; for example, both the *Chanson de Jérusalem* and the *Chanson d'Antioche* describe the earliest crusaders as travelling east in order to avenge Christ upon their enemies.[182] However, such notions were given fresh impetus by the collapse of the Kingdom of Jerusalem as well as the subsequent preaching of the Third Crusade. *Audita tremendi* presented the Maccabees as models of behaviour, 'zealous for divine law', and eager to relinquish both their belongings and their lives for their fellows;[183] and while it did not employ the language of vengeance itself, the letter makes imperative the correction of sins, both on the part of God against the unrepentant and on the part of the faithful upon the enemies of God. Some later writers even suggested that failure to take vengeance would merit further retribution from heaven.[184] Those narratives produced soon after 1187 certainly reflect an impetus to vengeance. IP1 describes Richard I as taking the cross in order to avenge the injury of the Cross,[185] while Joscius Archbishop of Tyre, in spreading the news of Christ's imperilled inheritance, supposedly reduced some to weeping and stirred others to vengeance'.[186] Beyond the impact of 1187, vengeance no doubt remained well associated with crusading efforts in the early thirteenth century owing to the influence of Innocent III.[187] While the language of vengeance was absent from earlier encyclicals such as *Audita tremendi* and *Quantum praedecessores*, Innocent would, in a number of documents, call on Christians to seek vengeance for Christ, even going so far as to include vengeance as a central element of the crusading tradition when, in *Quanta sit circa*, he involved vengeance in the words of Matthew 16:24, writing: 'he who wishes to come after me, must deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me, putting on the sign of the cross you ought to seek to avenge the injury of Jesus Christ'.[188]

It is only after the ascendancy of Innocent III that we can be sure of an

181 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 77–80.

182 N. R. Thorp (ed.) *La Chanson de Jérusalem* (Tuscaloosa, 1992), p. 39, 58, 65, 125. Jan Nelson (ed.) *La Chanson d'Antioche* (Tuscaloosa, 1992), p. 51, 59, 72.

183 1 Maccabees 3:58–9. Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges*, p. 9.

184 Axel Wallensköld (ed.), *Les Chansons de Conon de Béthune* (Paris, 1921), p. 9.

185 Mayer, *Das Itinerarium Peregrinorum,* p. 276.

186 IP, p. 59.

187 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance,* pp. 142–3.

188 O. Hageneder and A. Haidacher (eds.) *Die Register Innocenz' III*, 8 vols (Graz, 1964–2001), i, p. 22. Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, p. 124.

author of a Third Crusade narrative actually employing an explicit appeal to vengeance on behalf of Christ in their battle orations. In an *oratio obliqua* oration at Jaffa, Richard supposedly encouraged his men arguing:

> Death should not at all be feared, [death] which was inflicted by the pagans for defending Christianity and avenging the injury of Christ; for it would be more magnificent to fall in honor for the laws of Christ, and to be prostrate before the enemies of Christ in death, than to give oneself like a coward to the enemies …[189]

Examples earlier than that of Ralph, such as those of Richard of Devizes and Roger of Howden, are comparatively anthropocentric. While Roger has Richard I claim that in assaulting the Greeks who have captured some of their fellows they will 'punish the wrongs the treacherous emperor has done to God and to us',[190] Richard of Devizes is even more focused on secular values, deploying the notion of vengeance in a fashion only concerned with the crusaders themselves:

> The king will keep no man against his will. I do not want to force anyone to stay with me, lest one man's fear in battle might destroy another's confidence. Let each man follow the course he chooses, but as for me, I will either die here or get revenge for my injuries, which are your injuries also.[191]

Although naturally distinguished by its circumstances, this oration on Sicily before battle against Christians is not wholly divergent from other orations which appeal to vengeance.

Both the *Itinerarium* and the *Libellus* deploy vengeance appeals in their battle rhetoric. However, unlike Ralph, these appeals are not formulated in direct relation to Christ, the cross, the Holy Land or on behalf of others, in spite of the presence of such notions in the wider narratives of many crusade accounts, as well as papal documents and evidence from popular preaching. Instead, the focus is on the audience of the orations, with Richard I concluding his harangue at Jaffa saying:

> True men should either triumph courageously or die gloriously. We should receive our approaching martyrdom with a grateful heart. But before we die, while life is still with us, we should avenge our death,

189 RC, pp. 44–5. Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, p. 121.
190 RH, iii, p. 106.
191 RD, p. 21.

> giving thanks to God that we have found in martyrdom the sort of death we were striving for.[192]

Similarly, Gerard de Ridefort supposedly addressed a force of Templars and Hospitallers in a manner wherein vengeance (*vindicta*) is presented as an established and continual aspect of their profession: 'My dearest brothers and fellow soldiers, you have always withstood these deceitful and fallen ones; you have exacted vengeance on them; you have always had victory over them'.[193]

Unlike the rhetoric of Richard of Devizes, vengeance is only a part of what are comparatively far more pious orations, which centre on service to God. Indeed, while the *Itinerarium* places the notion of vengeance in an appeal to martyrdom, the author of the *Libellus* has Gerard locate the vengeance taken by the Military Orders within their broader fight 'for the Church, for the law, for the heritage of the Crucified'. While it is difficult to draw broad conclusions from only two examples, especially given the likelihood that the orations of the *Libellus* were originally penned in the late-twelfth century, these orations seem to reflect the extent to which notions of vengeance had been integrated into crusading ideology, and the ideology of sanctified violence more broadly, into the early thirteenth century. By this time such notions no longer requiring the language of family or social obligation common to earlier vengeance appeals. Vengeance in the early thirteenth century seems to have become well understood as an aspect of the military service to Christ signified by the crusader cross. As has been argued by Throop, the continual lack of success in the Holy Land would prompt numerous writers to continue to deploy the cross at the centre of a mytho-history wherein the ultimate injury to the cross, the Crucifixion, continued to demand vengeance.[194] In the case of the *Libellus*, when exactly the speech attributed to Gerard was written perhaps mattered less than the fact its words still resonated a generation later, initially reflecting the special status of the Military Orders and their significant sacrifices during the calamities of 1187.

Spiritual Reward and Martyrdom

As with many other motivational appeals already discussed, 1187 and the Third Crusade seemingly prompted particular shifts in how the previously common, and obviously apt, appeals to spiritual reward, and the status of martyrdom were deployed in battle rhetoric. For example, the trend, discussed in Chapter Four, away from the appearance of appeals to spiritual

192 IP, p. 417. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 362.
193 LTS, pp. 114–5.
194 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, p. 143.

reward in orations delivered by laymen, as well as a focus on the necessity of Christian rites in order to ensure such rewards, does seem to have continued into the thirteenth century. In the first speech at Iconium found in the *Historia Peregrinorum*, the Emperor Frederick addresses his son in a speech which concludes:

> He who has the help of food should share it with someone not having any. For tomorrow, whatever happens to us, we shall all be enriched, since either triumphing over the enemy we will be filled with their spoils and the food of those enemies or, dying for Christ we should enjoy with him the abundance of celestial goods.[195]

This example, as well as others, contrasts with contemporary or near contemporary non-crusading orations wherein laymen do not deliver promises of spiritual reward. This rule trend holds even when commanders deliver an otherwise pious oration, such as that of William the Breton describing Bouvines. Similarly, although perhaps originally drafted prior to 1187, an oration in the *Gesta Henrici II et Gesta Regis Ricardi* includes a long oration by the earl of Arundnel at Breteuil in 1173 which places great focus upon intention, authority and the divine:

> Further, consider in your hearts, how unjust and against God the rashness of the king of France and the error of the sons of the invincible king of England our lord is against him, and by their own will. Therefore, place your hope in the Lord God, and fight manfully, because Christ is the son of the living God, Who was made obedient to the Father even unto death, in the minds of the sons of the king today filial obedience to our lord will inspire them, or in refusing expose injustice to God himself, [Who] today will punish the crimes of the treacherous Frenchmen, who have been so greatly led astray that they seem to have forgotten the order of humanity and free from the law of nature have risen up against the parents, the sire of the begotten.[196]

Despite its subject matter, and the fact that the text draws heavily from Henry of Huntingdon's oration at the Standard which concludes with the speaker Ralph, Bishop of the Orkneys, promising absolution, no such appeals are included at Breteuil. Instead, the soldiers are told they will either win or they shall die,[197] in contrast to orations where physical victory was often juxtaposed with spiritual victory.

Where such appeals occur after 1187, it is the notion of dying for Christ,

195 HP, p. 168.
196 BP, pp. 52–3.
197 BP, p. 53.

rather than the performance of confession or other rituals at the direction of clergymen, which is most closely associated with heavenly reward. In his *oratio obliqua* oration at Jaffa, Ralph of Coggeshall has Richard I claim that there is nothing to fear in death if one is to die for Christ.[198] Furthermore, the reformulation of the crusader indulgence issued in 1198, arguably of greater significance in this regard than the events of 1187, no longer depended upon the hardship of the penitential act which was assured as satisfactory.[199] Concordantly no appeal to spiritual reward in Third Crusade battle rhetoric involves notions of penitential suffering or hardship. Rather, the newly assured promise of remission of sin was the reward for devout performance in the service of God, for which the ultimate service of dying for the cause merited the ultimate reward of martyrdom. This is how spiritual reward is presented in the final, and longest, of the orations of the *Itinerarium*, a speech greatly expanded from the version of Ambroise,[200] which concludes:

> We should receive our approaching martyrdom with a grateful heart. But before we die, while life is with us, we should avenge our death, giving thanks to God that we have found in martyrdom the sort of death we are striving for. This is the wages of our labours and the end of our life and our battles.[201]

The narrative of IP2 as a whole displays great interest in martyrdom, repeatedly relating anecdotes of individual or groups of Eastern Christians and crusaders made martyrs.[202] The other instances of hortatory direct speech at Jaffa delivered by Richard I centre on self-sacrifice in the service of God, done for fellow Christians and the inheritance of Christ. Upon reaching the besieged Jaffa, Richard supposedly addressed those hesitant to depart from their ships saying: 'Surely this cowardly rabble blockading the shore won't prevent us from landing? Or do we reckon that our lives are more valuable than the lives of those who are perishing in our absence?'[203] The same message is reiterated soon after this address when the king is told that the survivors in the city have been driven into a tower and will soon perish: 'When the king heard this, he said: 'If it so pleases God in whose service and with whose leadership we have come here that we should die here with our brothers, death only to those who do not advance!''[204]

Beyond self-sacrifice, other elements of hardship and suffering found

198 RC, pp. 44–5.
199 Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, p. 121.
200 AM, i, p. 185.
201 IP, p. 417. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 362.
202 IP, pp. 16–7, 23–4, 70, 73–4, 265–6, 401–2, 405–6, 439–40.
203 IP, p. 407. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 355.
204 IP, p. 408. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 355.

alongside such notions in earlier battle rhetoric are, in the *Itinerarium,* discussed chiefly in reference to God's punishment of sin, rather than as an element of active repentance borne in imitation of Christ. This is a reverse of what can be observed from a survey of First Crusade battle rhetoric, wherein appeals to suffering and its crucial redemptive aspect far outnumber promises that those who perished would be martyrs. Examining this kind of motivational appeal also highlights, as has been argued earlier, the divergence in priorities between particular authors of Third Crusade narratives. It is revealing that, for example, neither Richard of Devizes nor Roger of Howden employs any form of spiritual reward appeal in his battle rhetoric, in spite of the popularity of such notions in twelfth-century battle rhetoric. Echoing his Breteuil oration, Roger has Richard I tell his troops at Cyprus that they must either win or die.[205] Conversely, in responding to the oration by Gerard de Ridefort at Spring of Cresson, the members of the Military Orders supposedly were to declare with one voice (*omnes uno ore*): 'We are indeed ready and prepared to suffer death for Christ, who by his precious death redeemed us, knowing that, whether we live or die, we are always victors in the name of Jesus'.[206] This affirmation of the exhortation emphasizes the Christ-like position the Military Orders profess to be taking up, but in crafting this reply from the words of Romans 14:8 the author of the *Libellus* provides an exegetically rich message. Centrally, this passage forms part of an extended call by Paul for Christian unity, preceding Paul's assertion that Christ died and rose to be lord of all, and that judging or despising fellow Christians is meaningless when all will be judged by Christ.[207] Coupled with the readiness to embrace death this statement is a verbal fulfilment of the injunction, which in other sources was explicitly identified with the Military Orders, that was prescribed by John 15:13.[208] Moreover, Romans 14:8 was also the same passage Bernard of Clairvaux presents as almost the mantra of the Templars:

> Therefore, knights, go forth confidently, and with a stalwart heart drive back the foes of the Christ's cross, certain that neither death nor life is able to separate you from the love of God which is in Jesus Christ, repeating in every danger: 'Whether we live or die, we are the Lord's'.[209]

While neither Gerard de Ridefort nor Roger des Moulins promise their audiences the martyr's crown, the broader narrative of the *Libellus* is highly

205 RH, iii, pp. 106–7.
206 LTS, pp. 114–5.
207 Romans 14:8–10.
208 Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, pp. 106–8.
209 'Liber ad milites Templi de laude novae militiae'. Leclercq et al., *Sancti Bernardi opera*, iii, pp. 214–5. Nicholson, 'Depictions of the Military Orders', pp. 102–3.

concerned with martyrdom and salvation, arguably to a greater degree than the *Itinerarium*. Such notions are certainly treated far more extensively in the battle rhetoric of the *Libellus*. Of course, the praise of heroic past crusaders as well as the advancement of a coherent crusading ideology, adapted to the events of 1187 and its aftermath, were far from mutually exclusive in the later thirteenth century. On the other hand, even other orations which centre on heroic individual crusaders, such as Roger de Moulins in the *Libellus*, or outside of the context of the Holy Land, Simon de Montfort, as he is depicted by the *Historia Albigensis*, are not provided with appeals to spiritual reward. In the *Historia Albigensis* such rhetoric is entirely the reserve of the Bishop of Comminges, who delivers an extended oration on this subject at the Battle of Muret which emphasizes the role of the clergy in this matter:

> Go forth in the name of Jesus Christ! I am your witness, and will stand as surety on the Day of Judgement, that whosoever shall fall in this glorious battle will instantly gain his eternal reward and the glory of martyrdom, free from the punishment of purgatory, so long as he is repentant and has made confession, or at least has the firm intention of presenting himself to a priest as soon as the battle is over for absolution from any sins he has not yet confessed.[210]

While largely the preserve of clergymen in the thirteenth century, appeals to spiritual reward, like those of vengeance, were commonly formulated as being one aspect of the ideal of military service to Christ which came to be represented by the cross. Unlike Richard I's final oration of the *Itinerarium*, which fails to even mention Christ or the crosss, Roger des Moulins' oration assures his audience that they will live eternally following not a physical encounter with the enemy, but a spiritual encounter with Christ. Similarly, in his final instances of direct speech in the *Historia Albigensis*, delivered shortly before his death, Simon de Montfort makes no promises on behalf of the divine, but simply reaffirms his loyalty even unto death, and dependence on, Christ and the Crucifixion.[211] The power of these particular instances of course lies in the foreknowledge of the authors. In the case of the *Libellus*, Roger's speech stands out for its endurance relevance to those vexed by the continual lack of crusading success in the Holy Land into the 1220 s, reaffirming the link between spiritual devotion and physical (as well as spiritual) triumph.

210 Guébin and Lyon, *Historia Albigensis*, p. 152. W. A. Sibly and M. D. Sibly (trans.), *History of the Albigensian Crusade: Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay's 'Historia Albigensis'* (Woodbridge, 1998), p. 209.

211 Guébin and Lyon, *Historia Albigensis,* p. 313.

Conclusion

As was the case in Chapter Four, a broad and systematic analysis of the battle rhetoric of Third Crusade narratives in comparison with earlier texts displays elements of both continuity and change. However, while the battle rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi* by and large reflects the development of ideas common to First Crusade orations written prior to the 1140s, the material this chapter has examined displays a greater degree of change. In part this is due to the nature of the source material, which is crucially far more extensive for the period between c. 1187 and c. 1222. This is to an extent the result of the shifting reality of the Latin East at the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century, notably the losses of 1187 but also, even following the territorial gains of the Third Crusade and Crusade of 1197, the ongoing lack of success in the Holy Land. However, in spite of the ultimate failure of the Third Crusade, it is obvious that the preparation and execution of such a vast and complex military undertaking provoked serious and continual interest in the campaign long after 1192. Although unable to celebrate the recapture of Jerusalem, authors still found the encounters and victories of the Third Crusade, unlike the eastward campaign of the Second Crusade, suitable for the rhetorical embellishment of battle orations.

Authors writing soon after the events they chronicled, specifically Roger of Howden and Richard of Devizes, employ battle rhetoric in a far less didactic sense than was typical prior to 1187. In their orations appeals to wealth, reputation and feats of arms feature prominently and unabashedly. Moreover, many of the same appeals are likewise well represented in the battle rhetoric of the *Itinerarium*, although the rhetoric of Book I is reflective of a traditional explanatory framework in which the kind of boastfulness borne of military success, which often gave way to the sin of pride, is clearly condemned. The *Itinerarium* also employs an entire oration to the end of criticizing the rash and divisive action of those who conducted the early charge at Arsuf, and thus endangered the entire Christian army. Nevertheless, it is impossible to ignore the extent to which the heroics of the crusaders, particularly Richard I, take centre stage in the narrative, explaining usually uncommon appeals such as wealth. In this sense the *Itinerarium* can be compared with the *Expugnatio Hibernica*, written by Gerald of Wales in support of the activities of the earliest Norman invaders of Ireland, including his own relatives. While treating seriously and at length appeals to the justice of the Norman cause, as well as their good intentions, the authority behind their actions and ultimately pressing necessity, the battle rhetoric of *Expugnatio* is also heavily preoccupied with the praise of its heroes.

In primarily being concerned with the exaltation of the deeds of its central characters the rhetoric of Roger of Howden's *Chronica*, also found in the chronicle formerly attributed to Benedict of Peterborough, as well as the account of Richard of Devizes, differs sharply in nature from crusading

orations of previous expeditions. These texts, unlike those found in many First Crusade narratives as well as the *Lyxbonensi*, are not greatly concerned with utilizing battle rhetoric in order to construct or advance a particular formulation of crusade ideology, and their orations are characterized by more classical allusions and language than scriptural references. While this might be expected of a clerk in royal service, such rhetoric from the pen of a Benedictine monk diverges considerably from comparable material produced by northern French Benedictines in the early twelfth century and remains to an extent the case regarding IP2 when that text's own origins are considered. In contrast with these texts, the rhetoric of Ralph of Coggeshall's *Chronicon Anglicanum* makes the notion of fighting for Christ with the aid of God central to its battle rhetoric. Another Cistercian source, the *Historia Peregrinorum*, actually expands on the earlier *Historia de expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* seemingly in order to reinforce the notion of the expedition as a pilgrimage taking place under the auspices of the cross.

That authors such as Roger of Howden, Richard of Devizes and the IP2 author felt no need to use battle rhetoric in order to formulate a particular ideology of crusading, in contrast to men such as Baldric of Bourgueil, Robert of Rheims or Guibert of Nogent is no doubt in part due to the fact that from the middle of the twelfth century onwards theologians and canonists would increasingly account for the nature of crusading in their works. By the early thirteenth century, the practice of crusading, having been earlier ignored in the works of Gratian, was well incorporated into broader theories on just war, in which holy war became a well understood facet of the wider phenomenon. It is certainly not the case that Roger, Richard of Devizes, and the IP2 author were far from the only partisan authors who praised a particular figure through battle rhetoric, with William the Breton crafting an oration at Bouvines which emphasized the virtue and piety of Philip Augustus, in the context of a sanctified kind of just war, distinguishable from crusading almost entirely by the crusader vow.

Rather than requiring elegant formulation or defence, the practice of crusading would thrive in the early thirteenth century and in this regard the preoccupation of the *Itinerarium* with the participants of the Third Crusade, identified in later encyclicals ultimately by their failure, becomes easy to understand. Beyond the Third Crusade, the continual lack of success in the Holy Land was no doubt a strain on the traditional explanatory framework of crusading narratives, wherein repentance would ultimately bring about victory. Yet this strain, while perhaps a problem for narrative authors, evidently did not prompt a broader ideological shift. Instead, the evidence of papal documents and that of popular preaching during the pontificate of Innocent III illustrates the extent to which the practice of crusading, and efforts at broader social and spiritual reform, went hand-in-hand. While seeming to retreat from battle rhetoric in this period, the devotional, penitential and didactic ideas common to earlier crusading orations appear to become the reserve of the expanded and formalizing institutions of crusade

preaching in the early thirteenth century. Moreover, where spiritual appeals are found in the battle rhetoric of Third Crusade narratives, there is very little of the previously prolific penitential and devotional formulations of such appeals, so well represented in earlier accounts. Instead, such motivators often centre on the image of the cross and reflect an understanding of this symbol as being a badge of military loyalty, rather than in the quasi-monastic sense it previously reflected. This is in concordance with the proposed disentanglement of crusading from penitential pilgrimage which developed apace in the wake of the disasters of 1187.

As the products of extended periods of compilation, the *Itinerarium* and the *Libellus* illustrate two different perspectives on the development of crusading from 1187 and on into the thirteenth century. Beyond Book I, the *Itinerarium* only employs spiritual appeals in its battle rhetoric, which reinforce the virtue, chiefly those of bravery and loyalty, of the crusaders. Although, assured of martyrdom in the final oration of Richard I, the same speech remains centred upon the physical struggle against the enemies of Christ, with Richard charging his men to 'triumph courageously or die gloriously'.[212] Conversely, in the longer of the two paired orations of the *Libellus*, the author provides Roger des Moulins with an oration which centrally separates physical victory from spiritual victory, making clear its focus is not on triumph over the enemy, but on triumph over sin, a necessity in order to ultimately achieve victory.

While separation of repentance from victory in the immediacy was no doubt a message that remained relevant to the situation in the Holy Land by the 1220 s, it is clear which of these two perspectives found the greater audience. The *Libellus* has been described as more a religious than historical work;[213] however, if indeed of ultimately Cistercian provenance, it could be argued to share much in common with works such as Aelred's *Relatio* where extended battle orations serve to construct the conflict it describes in a particular spiritual fashion. The far more popular and widely known *Itinerarium* (which the later *Libellus* author recommends to readers), while not as irreligious in its narrative as that of Richard of Devizes, for example, nevertheless seems to attempt to outstrip even the vernacular account of Ambroise in terms of its interest in the details and drama of the events it depicts. Moreover, this is certainly the case when comparing the content and extent of their battle rhetoric. Its success as a narrative certainly must lie to an extent in its synthesis of powerful religious motivators, which still resonated amongst secular and ecclesiastical elites in the early thirteenth century, with its focus on a heroic Christian king and his crusading warriors.

212 IP, p. 417. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, p. 362.

213 Kane, 'Wolf's Hair', p. 99.

Conclusions

This book has analyzed the pre-battle oration in Latin narrative chronicles of an elongated twelfth century, seeking to move away from dealing with such speeches as sources of data in order to better appreciate their literary and rhetorical value. A properly contextualized survey of the hortatory content of battle orations from the first century of the crusading movement dispels the notion that they were generic and interchangeable, instead emphasizing the inventive, dynamic nature of the genre.

This study has not sought to engage specifically with the question of how common pre-battle speeches actually were, or the practical realities of addressing massed soldiers on the battlefield in the pre-modern world. However, the power of this pervasive convention, invented, reinvented or otherwise, to shape perceptions of warfare and its participants, remains evident. On 19 March 2003, Colonel Tim Collins of the 1st Battalion, Royal Irish Regiment, delivered a supposedly extemporized address to his troops, recorded by attached journalist Sarah Oliver, upon the eve of the invasion of Iraq.[1] Excerpts of the address, which made reference to the biblical history of Iraq, and was described as evocative of the poetry of Yeats, circulated widely through contemporary news coverage.[2] In the immediate aftermath of the invasion, Collins' words drew praise for their articulation of an uncompromising yet compassionate liberation, as opposed to conquest, of the Iraqi people.[3] The repute of Colonel Collins was bolstered dramatically in the wake of this reporting, with Oliver's transcript of his oration being compared with those of Churchill or Shakespeare's Henry V. Not only did the speech demarcate a construction of the Iraq conflict as a just war, it served as a crucial counterpoint when the Colonel's own reputation was

1 Tim Collins, 'Colonel Tim Collins' Iraq war speech in full', *The Telegraph*, 19 October 2008, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/3562917/Colonel-Tim-Collins-Iraq-war-speech-in-full.html (accessed 29 November 2017).

2 William Warren, 'The Battle Speech That Defined A War', 7 June 2016, https://www.forces.net/news/tri-service/battle-speech-defined-war (accessed 26 September 2018).

3 'UK Troops Told: Be Just and Strong', *BBC News*, 20 March 2003, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/2866581.stm (accessed 26 September 2018).

later threatened by reports of misconduct, published in the *Sun* newspaper. Oliver, among others, spoke out in support of Collins and in 2004, the allegations were dropped.[4] The case of Collins demonstrates how much one can hinge on how rhetorical invention and literary construction presented conflicts and combatants, particularly in regard to motivation and conduct, to observers 'back home'. That the pre-battle speech provided medieval authors, particularly those writing about the early crusade movement, with an ideal opportunity to elaborate on the ideology of the innovative kind of warfare Urban II called for at Clermont, as well as to construct that kind of warfare in a fashion that held important moral and didactic lessons regarding intention and behaviour, is the central assertion of this work.

Chapter One explored the place of rhetoric in medieval historical writing, and specifically its relevance to battle orations, in order to illustrate how battle rhetoric was part of a long tradition of historical writing that valued rhetorical plausibility and verisimilitude. This dedication to perceived authenticity is best understood in light of the challenges of the so-called 'linguistic turn' which understands even supposed eyewitness accounts not as infallible or repositories of facts, requiring careful extraction, but as purposefully crafted literary artefacts.[5] Regarding the earliest crusade narratives, more recent scholarship has also considered the extent to which these constructions reflect any real experience of crusading.[6] Of great influence on the narratives considered herein were classical principles of rhetoric, which taught not only the deployment of material that was apt and verisimilar, with truth needing rhetoric in order to appear true, but also urged that rhetoric be seriously concerned with ethics and moral behaviour. The lessons of classical rhetoricians came down to the medieval world through Augustine and the Church Fathers, who elaborated at length on the distinction of facts from truths. The conception of history that these principles informed, instituted by authors such as Orosius and Eusebius, mapped out the cycles of sin, punishment and victory which remained at the heart of battle rhetoric in the twelfth century. Scripture, not limited to the Old Testament, was also a direct influence on battle rhetoric, and many notions from the Gospels or monastic *lectio divina* found their way into actual combat orations.

Recent work on the place of ethics in the writings of William of Malmesbury has highlighted the importance of understanding how the

4 Stephen Moss, 'Hero or Villain?', *The Guardian,* 22 May 2003, https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2003/may/22/military.warcrimes [accessed 26 September 2018]. 'Colonel Wins Libel Damages', *BBC News*, 2 April 2004, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/northern_ireland/3593027.stm [accessed 26 September 2018].

5 Kempf, 'Towards a Textual Archaeology of the First Crusade', p. 116.

6 Marcus G. Bull, 'Views of Muslims and of Jerusalem in Miracle Stories, *c*. 1000-*c*. 1200: Reflections on the Study of the First Crusaders' Motivations', in *The Experience of Crusading: 1 Western Approaches*, ed. by Marcus G. Bull and Norman Housley (Cambridge, 2003), p. 16.

writing of histories was guided by reference to their role within the social community, and how shifts in that community's conception could have repercussions on how different kinds of social, religious and political practices were constituted.[7] Moreover, that historical narratives and battle rhetoric in particular aimed at verisimilitude, attempting to explain the course of historical events[8] whilst also having didactic purposes, was in no way hindered by medieval understandings of history. This moralizing end to enquiry was not static and had to be continually performed,[9] and a long view of battle rhetoric displays well how the nature of this continual performance evolved over time. Chapter One also argued that these moral and didactic lessons could be received by an audience outside of the monastic environment, within which narratives were more often than not produced.

In Chapter Two, the hortatory content of one of the earliest crusading narratives, the *Gesta Francorum*, was considered against contemporary non-crusading orations, as well as the conclusions of the broader statistical analysis of battle rhetoric conducted by John Bliese. Rather than providing an insight into the intention of crusaders to slaughter hated enemies or seek wealth,[10] the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* shows little interest in praising martial prowess or promising spoils. Instead, the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta* reinforces, through dramatic direct speech, the idea of a divinely directed war fought by those of righteous intention. This formulation of Christian warfare was ancient by the eleventh century, yet the *Gesta*'s battle rhetoric is distinguished from all predecessors by a penitential spirituality reflective of contemporary monastic and ecclesiastical reform, as well as penitential pilgrimage. This context illuminates the significance of motivational appeals which have hitherto been given little serious attention in the study of battle rhetoric, such as the appeals to the Holy Cross, the Holy Sepulchre, the emphasis on Christian unity, as well as the ideal of the *miles Christi* and the *ecclesia primitiva.*

Chapter Three analyzed how later First Crusade authors deployed battle rhetoric in their works. Although naturally revealing a significant degree of variance in their rhetorical inventions, and so displaying the narrative priorities of particular authors, comparative analysis provides a broader picture of the development of the central themes of First Crusade battle rhetoric. Like the *Gesta*, most later authors downplayed appeals to martial virtues or notions of earthly glory and honour, only developing such notions seemingly when they could be utilized to support specific themes, notably divine direction and righteous intention. This is likewise

7 Sigbjørn Olsen Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury and the Ethics of History* (Woodbridge, 2012), p. 16.
8 Staunton, *Historians of Angevin England*, p. 12.
9 Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury*, p. 20.
10 Bliese, 'The Just War as Concept and Motive', pp. 11–3.

the case with appeals to material reward, which are invariably presented as 'God-given' or contrasted with the superior rewards of heaven. Otherwise spoils and the sin of greed are employed in highly didactic ways, providing illustrative warnings against battlefield looting. Building on work that has argued forcefully that morals and ethics can inform particular practices, this research could inform greatly the further investigation into the practice of seizing riches upon crusade, which takes into account the importance of motivation but also how the piety of taking spoils could be actively practised. In this regard, instances such as Robert of Normandy's repurposing of the prized standard captured at Ascalon as a devotional gift provide excellent guiding examples.[11]

Later, First Crusade battle rhetoric shows a continued lack of interest in appeals to *gentes* beyond the collective descriptor of 'Franks' who, as in the *Gesta*, are defined chiefly by their faith, rather than by martial prowess. This is concordant with another key theme found throughout First Crusade battle rhetoric, the notion of unity, not only amongst the crusaders, but throughout the Christian community more broadly. This lacuna of appeals to particular *gentes* raises further questions as to how crusading identity was formulated in regard to national and racial identity. This avenue of questioning would no doubt benefit greatly from more comparative work on Latin and vernacular narratives and orations.

Battle rhetoric in First Crusade sources also served as a way in which the sanctity of the endeavour could be continually reaffirmed, most obviously through appeals to divine aid and heavenly reward, often delivered, crucially, by laymen with no mention of attached Christian rites. Moreover, an analysis of crusading rhetoric is consonant with the widely recognized 'theological development' or refinement of the expedition by later authors. Spencer has highlighted how notions of martyrdom, while present in the *Gesta*, become far more pronounced in later accounts,[12] and that this development is reinforced by a comparison of battle rhetoric. That battle rhetoric came to be dominated by the notion of martyrdom could be argued to represent a step in western European writing in the early twelfth century towards an evolved notion of the First Crusade as a holy war, where fighting was spiritually meritorious and was both related to and yet in some fashion distinct from penitential pilgrimage. This merits further investigation, however, as other notions evidently essential to the presentation of the First Crusade found in the *Gesta*, and influenced by contemporary clerical notions surrounding penitential pilgrimage, such as the redemptive nature of suffering, are also utilized by later crusade authors in battle rhetoric despite being absent from the orations of the *Gesta*. The changing reality of the

11 GF, p. 97.

12 Stephen J. Spencer, 'The Emotional Rhetoric of Crusader Spirituality in the Narratives of the First Crusade', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 58 (2014), p. 71.

Latin East following the capture of Jerusalem seems, for example, to have prompted a triumph of the Holy Cross as an appeal over the Holy Sepulchre which, although appearing in the battle rhetoric of the *Gesta*, fails to find a place in the much more expansive corpus of later crusade orations.

As is the case with the *Gesta*, later crusading battle rhetoric seems to principally reflect an understanding of the First Crusade as a divinely guided endeavour conducted by penitent combatants who formed a moral community, with their right intention and penitential spirituality ensuring discipline. While Bliese has questioned the extent to which justice or an understanding of just war informed battle orations, the influence upon First Crusade battle rhetoric of certain Augustinian ideas, deployed in the eleventh century by authors such as Anselm of Lucca, is evident, as is the concern over justice expressed by many narrative authors in an age prior to the increased systemization of canon law following Gratian. Such a concern was of course entirely in line with an understanding of history as it had come down to the twelfth century; however, this conception was not static and required continual pious reassertion, and as later chapters display, reformulation.

Chapter Four, centred on *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, argued for an even greater reluctance to highlight martial prowess in the narrative's orations, when compared to First Crusade examples, with notions of honour, glory and shame being deployed chiefly to reinforce commitment to the divergent expedition, or being otherwise involved in broader religious motivational appeals. It is possible to set the example of *Lyxbonensi* within a broader trend against martial appeals or appeals to the personal glory or honour of combatants between 1145 and 1187. While this is of course far from universal, with such notions being well utilized by Helmold of Bosau, numerous orations attempting to depict just or sanctified fighting make little or no reference to what Bliese argued was the most potent appeal for soldiers to hear before battle. Prideful boasting of bellicose ability is in fact used by Aelred of Rievaulx to mark out the savage and ultimately defeated Gallovidian soldiers in his account of the Battle of the Standard. Like that text, an assembly of rightfully intentioned Anglo-Normans take centre-stage; however, unlike Aelred's *Relatio*, Raol makes no mention of Norman achievement in his pre-battle speech, and while Hervey of Glanville discusses racial reputation, it is not in order to convince the divergent faction to uphold any kind of ancestral achievement. It is for this reason, as well as the appearance of many spiritual appeals common to First Crusade battle rhetoric, that *Lyxbonensi* should be understood as reflecting developed, yet nevertheless older, ideas of crusading. Not only is there no real sense in *Lyxbonensi* that *strenuitas patrum* has replaced *imitatio Christi,* as the crusade preaching of the Cistercians attempted to do, and like many First Crusade narratives, a lack of interest in appeals to *gentes* or *nationes* is perhaps best understood as conforming with a stress on unity. Like martial appeals, *Lyxbonensi* also displays a dearth of appeals to material wealth, related to its clear concern to display the moral reform and righteous

intention of the crusaders. A number of non-crusading contemporary orations share the trepidation over spoils and eagerness to condemn greed and avarice, even more so than First Crusade orations. This trend, like the broader trend against martial appeals, is best understood, it has been argued, in the light of the increasing attention paid to the justice of the conflicts being depicted. This is evidenced not only by the direct reference to works of canon law by authors such as Isidore of Seville, writings on just war by Augustine, as well as the synthesis of such works by Gratian, but is also reflected in the deployment and development of notions of authority, hitherto marginal, particularly in crusading battle rhetoric. Similarly, where *Lyxbonensi* employs reference to vengeance, this is done in the manner of certain First Crusade orations, on behalf of the 'family' of Christians. There is no hint of personal vengeance, and indeed contemporary non-crusading orations often make explicit reference to the authority under which soldiers sought vengeance in line with contemporary canon law. As well as commenting on the motivation and intention of soldiers, and the place of authority in enacting war, the developments of canon law ushered in by Gratian also sought to regulate and standardize the role of the clergy in warfare. It is within this context, as well as that of the broader reforms aimed at separating spiritual and temporal life, promoted by the First and Second Lateran, that the disappearance of promises of salvation delivered by laymen is best understood.

As is the case with many First Crusade orations, the set piece speeches of *Lyxbonensi* make extensive use of well-developed appeals to divine aid, which not only serve to sanctify the undertaking, but also highlight the importance of proper behaviour, rightful intention, moral reform and spiritual repentance, providing theologically rich yet accessible *exempla*. While many contemporary non-crusading orations also include extended appeals to divine aid, the rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi* is set apart from non-crusading contemporaries through its themes of unity, which relied upon discipline, charity and humility. Similarly, *Lyxbonensi* retains many of the penitential themes prominent in First Crusade battle rhetoric. The crusaders are continually associated with the cross, which is centrally deployed as a symbol of salvation and reinforces the notion that the crusaders were undertaking their journey for spiritual reward, even unto death and martyrdom, in imitation of Christ. This salvation is offered with no reference to an associated enactment of Christian rites, setting the *Lyxbonensi* apart from certain contemporaries but being in line with First Crusade examples. This mirrors Throop's understanding of the so-called Dartmouth Rules, which prescribed rites in a 'regular' rather than 'ad hoc' fashion and served to highlight the ongoing devotional intent of the crusaders. In this way, the *Lyxbonensi* displays crusading warfare as an opportunity for moral and spiritual reform which brought about triumph where others had failed. This thorough defence of the practice of crusading is perhaps best understood in the light of the development of competing forms of religious life, especially

the Military Orders, in the mid-twelfth century. While certainly of interest to the communities from which its central heroes came, the epistolary form of the narrative, as well as its evident moral and didactic nature, suggests a desire for it to find an even wider audience, even if the manuscript tradition casts doubt on whether this ever happened.

If the rhetoric of *Lyxbonensi* displays the development of many themes common to First Crusade battle rhetoric, the central work considered in Chapter Five illustrates how the fall of the kingdom of Jerusalem, the Third Crusade and perhaps most significantly the continual lack of success in the Holy Land, prompted a more fundamental shift in how authors constructed crusading and holy war through their narrative accounts. The *Itinerarium* presents one particular response to the developments in the fortunes of Latin power in the Holy Land in the late-twelfth and early thirteenth century. The IP2 author's *prologus* makes clear his intention to valorize the actions of Richard I and his crusaders, so that their *virtutes* will not be lost to memory, but instead will be recognized and celebrated. The battle rhetoric of the *Itinerarium* clearly reflects this priority. While hortatory direct speech is used early on in the narrative to reassert a traditional explanatory framework of sin bringing about defeat, and later to condemn excesses of knightly behaviour, there is much that is new in its deployment of certain motivational appeals. Not only does the *Itinerarium* deploy frequent and unusually well-developed appeals to martial virtues, it also makes clear that the exercise of such virtues, rather than the will of God, was required in order to avert disaster. That such 'heroic' material is found in such abundance in the *Itinerarium* is striking, especially in comparison to earlier crusade rhetoric and when contrasted with the vernacular Third Crusade account of Ambroise, as well as with other contemporary non-crusading orations such as the *Gesta Philipi Augusti*. On the other hand, this rhetorical focus on the actions of Richard and his companions was not novel, being clearly identifiable in the battle rhetoric of Richard of Devizes and Roger of Howden. In invoking a place for fortune alongside the exercise of martial virtues, the *Itinerarium* has much in common with the conquest of Ireland as depicted by Gerald of Wales.

The 'heroic' focus of the *Itinerarium* also colours how other notions common to battle rhetoric are deployed. The only recounted victories the text celebrates are those of Richard I, not of any particular *gens*, appeals to which are totally absent. While the IP2 author shows little interest in discussing riches, removing the promise of treasure from an oration originally penned by Ambroise, perhaps in line with continual ecclesiastical condemnation of avarice on crusade, the *Itinerarium* contains none of the active condemnations of greed found for instance in Albert of Aachen. Where spoils are discussed, this is without the anxiety and requirement for justification seen in Gerald's *Expugnatio*, and is done so principally to display the largess of Richard I. Moreover, it is the focus upon the actions of Richard and the crusaders, as well as the ultimate failure of the crusade, which

accounts for the striking dearth of appeals to divine aid in the rhetoric of the *Itinerarium*. This marks a clear departure both from earlier crusading rhetoric as well as some contemporary orations such as those found in German Third Crusade sources, although it is not altogether unique. The *Itinerarium's* rhetoric, like that of Richard of Devizes and Roger of Howden, is similarly bereft of the penitential spiritual appeals and notions of moral reform upon which victory was consequent. In contrast, the battle rhetoric of *Libellus* attempts to uncouple moral and spiritual reform through sanctified warfare from victory in the immediacy. A number of other significant appeals, including other spiritual appeals, appear in forms clearly influenced by the legacy of 1187 and the call and aftermath of the Third Crusade. In line with the lack of appeals reflective of the penitential spirituality central to First Crusade battle rhetoric, the symbol of the Cross, which often served as shorthand for a range of interconnected ideas centred on salvation, pilgrimage and *caritas*, is identified in the *Itinerarium* as a focal point for vengeance. Vengeance is also the most common form of an appeal to 'justice' found in Third Crusade battle rhetoric, in spite of the prevalence of other forms in non-crusading orations. However, appeals to vengeance explicitly on behalf of Christ only appear in Third Crusade narratives following the ascendancy of Innocent III, whose *Quanta sit circa* included vengeance as part of its formulation of Christ's injunction in Matthew 16:24. That vengeance had, by the early thirteenth century, been seamlessly integrated into the ideology of crusading is also evidenced by its deployment in battle rhetoric of that period without the sort of familial language that was common in the twelfth century. Instead, vengeance was understood as an aspect of military service to Christ, for which the cross served as both badge of loyalty and focal point of revenge. It is for this military service, enacted by the virtuous crusaders, that the *Itinerarium* presents martyrdom as being won, seemingly without the same sort of devotional framing, such as reference to penitential suffering, such appeals were given in First Crusade battle rhetoric. While it is difficult to fully account for this dramatic shift, it is crucial to understand the context of the changing nature of the crusade indulgence at the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century from the acceptance of crusading as sufficient penance to a guarantee of remission from sin. This is not to say that earlier conceptions of spiritual warfare expressed through battle rhetoric did not endure. However, works such as the *Libellus* illustrate how earlier notions of spiritual warfare and Christ-like self-sacrifice were still utilised in narrative constructions of crusading in the early thirteenth century. The *Libellus* then ultimately employs battle rhetoric in order to address the catastrophe and failures which plagued the Latin East in the late-twelfth and early thirteenth century in a fundamentally different way from the *Itinerarium*. Therein, spiritual victory is separated from physical victory, advancing the imperative for Christian warriors to triumph over sin, rather than the enemy, in order to be ultimately victorious.

In the light of this study, it is necessary to revise many of the conclusions of Bliese. Even if it could be maintained, contrary to the understanding of battle rhetoric advanced here, that battle orations provided direct insight into the psychology of medieval soldiery, the priorities of crusading rhetoric have nevertheless been shown to differ greatly from those previously posited. Following the success of the First Crusade, the battle rhetoric of the crusading movement was dominated not by the praise of martial prowess or the reputation of martial *gentes* but was, by and large, characterized by a particular form of bellicose yet penitential spirituality, where crusaders travelled to the East and faced hardship in imitation of Christ. This conception of crusading endured into the mid-twelfth century in spite of the failure of the Second Crusade and only seems to alter significantly following 1187. Rather than displaying the pragmatic, even bloodthirsty, priority of knights because of the demands of plausibility, Latin battle orations by and large reflected the ideology and concerns of their clerical or monastic authors. Moreover, the claim that battle rhetoric displays a disdain for conventions of just war or emphasizes the taking of spoils or hatred for the enemy over a concern for righteousness needs to be revised. An even broader examination of non-Latin or non-crusading battle rhetoric could bring the place of these notions in twelfth century constructions of warfare into yet sharper relief. The developments in crusading battle rhetoric charted by this study displays how battle rhetoric presents an ideal window not into the psychology of medieval soldiery, but to the developing ideology of the early crusading movement. As a recurring rhetorical form, the language of battle rhetoric allowed oration authors to express, in a dynamic fashion, the ideals and motivations of crusading. That motivational appeals are often difficult to isolate, being regularly interconnected or interdependent on other appeals, makes clear that any dichotomies between, for example, 'religious', 'secular' or 'economic' motivation, often presumed in modern historiography, was not always shared by those constructing crusade ideology. This should prompt further reconsideration of the place of material acquisitions, or the importance of gaining wider social status through crusading, in a fashion which does not frame such notions in opposition to, but rather as involved with, the serious spirituality which drove the crusading movement.[13]

Analysis of battle rhetoric could allow for fruitful investigation into other theatres of crusading and holy war which in their totality are beyond the scope of this present work, such as eastern Europe or the Iberian Peninsula. Furthermore, these findings highlight how the use of direct speech,

13 For a recent consideration of the extraction of sacred objects from the Holy land as an 'economic' motivation of crusading, see William J. Purkis, '"Holy Christendom's New Colony": The Extraction of Sacred Matter and the "Colonial" Status of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem', in *The Haskins Society Journal 30: 2018 Studies in Medieval History* (Cambridge, 2019), pp. 177–212.

particularly when it can be evidenced that such writings were the treatment of specific reworkings or revision, was a favoured tool of many medieval authors to elucidate certain central themes of their work, or signpost how they perhaps wished their works to be received.

The conclusions of Bachrach regarding the rhetorical tradition of plausibility can also be nuanced. A number of examples display how the status of orators has little to do with how embellished their rhetoric could plausibly be, most strikingly Aelred of Rievaulx has a layman deliver a very rhetorically complex oration in his *Relatio de Standardo*. The status and personality of Walter Espec would, moreover, have been familiar to the northern English society within which that text circulated. Furthermore, although the authors of First Crusade orations seem to have had little reluctance in having laymen deliver promises of spiritual reward, there is a detectable shift away from this practice in later twelfth century battle rhetoric prior to 1187.

The understanding of courage that we find in the battle rhetoric of the twelfth and early thirteenth century, particularly in the context of the crusading movement, certainly aligns with these priorities. Courage was not thought of as simple fearlessness, rather the opinions of Xenophon's Cyrus and Sallust's Catalina can be discarded, embracing instead the central conceit of battle rhetoric, that an overcoming of fear in a fearful situation is possible. An aid to this overcoming is reflected by a number of appeals that in some way employ reference to past perils that have themselves been overcome. That courage is a characteristic that can be learned, that frightened people can still perform courageous actions, and that the practice of courageous action can lead to ever higher states of fearlessness are all notions that have been reaffirmed by the work of psychologist Stanley Rachman.[14]

The medieval notion of courage we see reflected in battle rhetoric differs in some details from earlier understandings or formulations of that same virtue. One Aristotelian definition of courage presented in *Nicomachean Ethics* enshrines military valour as the highest, perhaps only true form of courage. By this understanding, fearlessness in the face of immediate emergency involving the risk of death, the highest degree of this being an emergency in war.[15] While battle rhetoric is naturally preoccupied with the circumstances of immediate danger, this priority is far from all-encompassing and, as has been demonstrated throughout, oration authors show a great deal of concern for matters outside of the immediacy of one's place in battle. These included the circumstances of fellow soldiers, repeatedly stressed as of crucial concern in First Crusade orations, but also of

14 Stanley J. Rachman, 'Fear and Courage: A Psychological Perspective, *Social Research*, 71, 1 (2004), pp. 149–76.

15 Andrei G. Zavaliy and Michael Aristidou, 'Courage: A Modern Look at an Ancient Virtue', *Journal of Military Ethics*, 13: 2 (2014), p. 176.

the unity and perseverance of the campaigning force, represented in cases such as the Lisbon campaign of 1147 by the sworn association of those observing the Dartmouth Rules. Whether through battle rhetoric or by other means, medieval authors identified those who abandoned such endeavours as lacking courage in a much more serious manner than those who balked at or fled from the immediate emergency of battle.[16]

Just being absent of fear in battle then is not a full picture of medieval courage, which has been demonstrated throughout is consistently presented as being aligned with the right motivations as well as actions (something that was not entirely absent from Aristotle's understanding either).[17] That some motives or passions, such as a hankering after earthly glory, are marginalized or removed entirely from the depictions of courage examined herein, and even bravery in battle is, in some instances, clearly presented as inferior to some higher or truer sense of courage. This is the case in the example of the savage, bellicose and fearless Galwegians found in Aelred's *Relatio*, but could also apply to the misguided or worthless courage of Saracen enemies, who are unaware that their abilities or triumphs are attributable ultimately to God, using such men for his own divine ends of bringing Christians to repentance and triumph.

In spite of the divine assurances that were foundational to the explanatory framework of so many crusade narratives, battle rhetoric as a rhetorical form calls to human agency by its very nature. In its function of exhortation and celebration, on top of its moralizing and didactic ends, the ancient and medieval understanding of a call to courage has its echoes in attempts by modern psychology to place courage within a dynamic system of human cognitive behaviour. Following the work of Rollo May and Paul Tillich, Craig Gruber has sought to define courage as the ability to change one's behaviour, environment or thoughts. Crucially Gruber describes this cognitive, voluntary process as something that is enacted upon a system with the intention of securing some sort of positive outcome.[18] This understanding fits well with much of the material with which this book is concerned, with the courage being called for in so many orations seeming to reflect not only the priorities of immediate battle, but with broader goals of behavioural, spiritual and societal reform. Such rhetorical material reflects an apparent confidence on the part of authors in the ability of their audiences, both narratively speaking and those who might encounter their work, to enact change with a positive end. It is far from surprising then that in, for example, the writings of Gerald of Wales, the language employed to advance the cause of Church reform echo those of battle rhetoric so strongly.

16 Aird, 'Many Others, Whose Names I Do Not Know, Fled With Them', p. 29.

17 Zavaliy and Aristidou, 'Courage: A Modern Look at an Ancient Virtue', p. 177.

18 Craig Gruber, 'The Psychology of Courage: Modern Research on an Ancient Virtue', *Integrative Psychological & Behavioural Science*, 45: 2 (2011), pp. 275–6.

Examples of such language, which present the enactment of change towards ends that have a sense of practically and realism about them, of being attainable, as well as being for the good of others, rather than the self, illustrate the degree to which modern conceptions of courage still contain within them the remains of their medieval forerunners.[19]

Notwithstanding a philosophical approach to the hortatory content of battle rhetoric, which understands the meaning of such language as dependent upon practice,[20] the extent of the impact of these narratives upon the actual actions of lay soldiers remains a difficult problem. While numerous examples of different forms of evidence, as well as work such as that of Bernard Bachrach,[21] signal to the possibilities of the wider reception of the words of battle rhetoric by an arm-bearing audience, particularly as the twelfth century progressed, serious obstacles remain. Certainly, it is not difficult to find instances of crusaders acting in a fashion which was evidently contrary to the sort of lessons battle rhetoric was often keen to impart, this is displayed by the efforts of increasingly formalized crusade preaching to combat many of the same vices. However, examples of the failure of individuals to live up to the loftier ideals of their communities and societies do not necessarily invalidate the broader significance of those ideals.

A possible avenue into the continued, revived or rediscovered meaning and impact of the words of battle rhetoric, as well as narrative histories more broadly, has been recently highlighted in regard to crusading by Damien Kempf, following the work of Hans Robert Jauss. While such a study would perhaps marginalize those works with a small manuscript tradition, the 'textual archaeology', Kempf discusses could also reveal where and how those works, which were little copied, nevertheless inspired readers or authors, who might wish to 'imitate, outdo, or refute' what they found.[22] That the battle rhetoric of the twelfth century, crusading or otherwise, could gain such a legacy is certainly validated by the broader historical, literary and cultural pervasiveness of the powerful trope of the pre-battle speech.

In so frequently stressing unity, in many cases being expressed in the same language with which the Vulgate described the *ecclesia primitiva*, battle rhetoric emphasized the communal nature of crusading. Likewise, in stressing justice, praising devotion and right intention, while condemning vices which caused division, this same notion was reinforced in its significance, not only in relation to active crusaders, but to the broader Christian community. This is in step with some recent crusading scholarship, notably Throop, and is reflective of the understanding of crusading as borne out of

19 Zavaliy and Aristidou, 'Courage: A Modern Look at an Ancient Virtue', p. 186.

20 This notion ultimately derived from the work of Ludwig Wittgenstein. Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury*, p. 12–7.

21 Bachrach, 'Writing Latin History for a Lay Audience', pp. 75–7.

22 Kempf, 'Towards a Textual Archaeology of the First Crusade', p. 126.

love and charity elucidated by Riley-Smith. Often considering the conduct of its Christian audience, imagined or actual, at much greater length than the attributes or behaviour of 'the enemy', further study into the use of direct speech in crusading narratives could provide valuable insight into how crusaders' relationships with their fellow combatants were understood, constructed and represented as part of the 'collective pursuit'[23] of a better Christian society. The fact that the moral and didactic lessons of battle rhetoric constituted, narratively speaking, a unifying principle around which the community of the audience could rally, highlights the significance of crusaders as a 'moral community', actively engaged in the performance of their own ethics.[24] That battle orations were understood by medieval authors to be an appropriate and effective rhetorical tool with which to elucidate the ever-protean ideology of the crusading movement is evident from their frequency and content, across a broad range of historical narratives. Moreover, the nature of this rhetorical form clearly provided an ideal opportunity for authors to engage with ideas around just war, pilgrimage and penance that came together conceptually through the crusading movement. It has been long recognized that the experience of the earliest crusaders was instrumental in establishing the ideology of crusading in the wake of 1099, and subsequent experiences of holy war, alongside ecclesiastical literary efforts, formed a crucial part of its development.[25] As has been argued, battle rhetoric has demonstrated itself to be a particularly dynamic and responsive avenue to tracing aspects of this development, in diverse contexts and across a significant chronological span. The formulations of holy war that crusading battle rhetoric contributed to, though always directed to particular communities through the audience of the in-narrative war host, were in some cases tremendously successful beyond those boundaries. The most notable example perhaps being that of Robert of Rheims, whose *Historia Hierosolymitana* proliferated extensively in German speaking lands throughout the twelfth century and beyond, in spite of its Northern French Benedictine origins. Conversely, works such as *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, and Aelred of Rievaulx's *Relatio de Standardo* make clear the community they addressed, and were perhaps never intended to find audiences much further afield.

The appeal of battle rhetoric to these audiences is easy to grasp in its generalities. The idea that groups look to their leaders for guiding and reassuring words before important engagements with meaningful risks is pervasive today across professional sport, business and other fields, as are its representations in popular media. In seeking to manage group anxieties, reinforce collective endeavour and combat disunity this form of motivational

23 Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, pp. 178–9.
24 Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury*, p. 20.
25 Riley-Smith, *First Crusade and the Idea*, pp. 58–120.

speaking has been broadly understood as bracing groups for some significant change in circumstances, and to encourage the enactment of change.[26] In that regard, the relevance to contemporary formulations of courage, even if a particular oration is not explicitly deploying the notion of courage, is readily apparent. This dynamic is of course applicable to crusading battle rhetoric and is particularly resonant in those instances wherein calls to pursue military victory in the immediacy bear upon the broader collective pursuits of a reforming and expanding Christendom, be it in the Holy Land or elsewhere. There are however some crucial particulars to the circumstances on which this work has focused. For example, the crusading battle rhetoric of the twelfth and early thirteenth century is almost always associated with victory. This is the case not only because the clerics and commanders that deliver pre-battle orations are urging their audiences onto victory, but also in the sense the pre-battle orations herein examined almost always take place prior to victory. Examples to the contrary are exceedingly rare, as are instances of paired speeches delivered by opposing commanders, despite this being a common feature of a number of classical examples of the genre.

In being largely produced by clerics or monks, chiefly in Latin, while at the same time foregrounding the actions of lay arms-bearing men and their martial achievements, crusading battle rhetoric reflects the interplay between life on campaign and the 'home front'. Be they crusade veterans or men who aspired to one day take the cross, the relevance of battle orations that exhorted and instructed warriors who were themselves ultimately successful also seems apparent. While questions of access remain pertinent, Chapter One discussed examples of instructional contact between arms bearers and members of monastic orders or clerics, and this study has demonstrated the extent to which much of crusading battle rhetoric communicated serious moral and didactic lessons. Moreover, these lessons were not as far removed from the concerns of soldiers and commanders as previously understood. The resonance of battle rhetoric, as an avenue of moral instruction, spiritual reform and the ideals of crusade, even when delivered through the monastic and clerical intermediaries, is no doubt in part due to its communal aspect. The common emphasis on unity, discipline and 'one-mindedness' being a clear indication of this. Almost all of the *oratio recta* examined herein is delivered to a mass assembly, and even where this is not the case, the individual being addressed nevertheless form part of the collective effort of battle. In unifying around the principles exhorting them, the victorious and thus righteous crusaders provided models of emulation amongst audiences at home. These ideals, often associated with broader spiritual and societal reform traversed the chasm between the battlefield and the world beyond. Moreover, these principles 'returned home', narratively speaking, along with successful crusaders. In being able to evocatively relay a sense of Christian

26 Yellin, *Battle Exhortation*, pp. 144–7.

unity and collective pursuit, the words of battle rhetoric were ideally suited as counter for communities experiencing serious fractiousness, in a way that went beyond simply being an effective metaphor. It is perhaps the case that some veterans of crusading hosts returned home with a renewed sense of Christian unity and moral direction, having received edification through something akin to the ‘moral schools’ Baldric describes.[27] Alternatively, the harsh realities of campaigning and battle may well have served to prompt a new sense of community or *caritas*, particularly between those who joined together by means of formal association. While the importance of lineage, family connections and traditions to the practice and memory of crusading has been the subject of recent and significant research, the bonds between crusading contemporaries have received a more varied level of scholarly interest.[28] More specifically, the dynamics of loyalty between the leading magnates of the First Crusade, often shifting and renegotiated throughout the campaign, are certainly better understood than the bonds and associations formed between poorer crusaders. Christopher Tyerman has recently drawn attention to the potential of commoners on crusade to leverage political power through means of formal associations, in combination with the ideals of Christian brotherhood. Tyerman notes the moral and practical elements of this solidarity, echoing William Zajac’s suggestion that the phenomenon of *conspirati* described by Albert of Aachen were more than simply lose associations of convenience between those crusaders who could not rely on the wealth of princes. Zajac’s proposition that such behaviour was akin to martial confraternities was by his admittance reliant on rather insubstantial evidence. However, this ground remains enticing to further enquiry because of how their emphasis on common need and equality amongst participants is echoed in the scriptural allusions to the early Christian community that are found across a number of early crusade narratives.[29] It is to such bonds that much of the crusading battle rhetoric of this period speaks, seeking to reinforce a unity grounded more in spirituality than martial achievement, national identity or the desire for material gain. In modelling the collective Christian pursuit of a better world, sought by means of sanctified warfare, crusading battle rhetoric exhorted communities across Christendom, implicitly encouraging their reform, renewal or transformation.

27 BB, p. 101.

28 As well as Nick Paul’s significant monograph, Lars Kjær has recently investigated the family backgrounds of a number of prominent participants of the First Crusade. Lars Kjær, ‘Conquests, Family Traditions and the First Crusade’, *Journal of Medieval History*, 45 (2019).

29 Christopher Tyerman, ‘Commoners on Crusade: The Creation of Political Space?’, *English Historical Review*, 136 (2021). William G. Zajac, ‘Captured Property of the First Crusade’, in *The First Crusade: Origins and Impact,* ed. by Jonathan Phillips (Manchester, 1997), pp. 167–9.

Not all contemporary chroniclers found battle orations to be an appropriate means to elucidate an ideology of crusading, but those that did seem to have overwhelmingly deployed them with serious care and attention. It is left to further research to determine if the propensity for authors to deploy this rhetorical trope in detailing sanctified violence and elucidating its principles endured beyond the period herein examined. The diffusion and institutionalization of crusading throughout the thirteenth century, along with the increasing deployment of crusading language and ideals towards nationalistic ends would suggest a necessary shift in the priorities of battle rhetoric, though perhaps not any dampening of the rhetorical form's resounding resonance.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Adam of Bremen, 'Adam von Bremen, Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte (Magistri Adam Bremensis gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum)', in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi*, vol. 2, ed. by Bernhard Schmeidler (Hanover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1917).

Aelred of Rievaulx, '*Genealogia regum Anglorum*' *in Beati Aelredi Abbatis Rievallensis Opera Omnia*, *PL*, 195, pp. 711–736.

—— 'Sermo XXIII. De Omnibus Sanctis II.', in *Beati Aelredi Abbatis Rievallensis Opera Omnia: Accedit Wolberonis Abbatis S. Pantaleonis Coloniensis Commentarium in Cantica*, *PL*, 195, pp. 339–48.

—— 'Relatio de Standardo', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. by Richard Howlett, Rolls Series, 82, 4 vols (London: Longman, 1886), pp. 181–201.

—— 'Aelred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works', in *Cistercian Fathers Series*, vol. 56, ed. by Marsha L. Dutton, trans. by Jane Patricia Freeland (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2005).

Albert of Aachen, *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Albert of Aachen, a Critical Edition*, ed. by Susan B. Edgington (PhD. Thesis, London, 1991).

—— 'Albert of Aachen: Historia Ierosolimitana: History of the Journey to Jerusalem', in *Oxford Medieval Texts*, ed. by Susan B. Edgington (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Amatus of Montecassino, ''Storia de' Normanni di Amato di Montecassino volgarizzata in antico francese', in *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, vol. 76, ed. by V. de Bartholomaeis (Rome: Tipografia Del Senato, 1935).

Ambroise, *The History of the Holy War: Ambroise's Estoire de la guerre sainte*, ed. by Marianne Ailes and Malcolm Barber, trans. by Marianne Ailes, 2 vols (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2003).

Andrew of Fleury, *Les Miracles de Saint Benoît écrits par Adrevald, Aimoin, André, Raoul Tortaire, et Hugues de Sainte Marie moines de Fleury Réunis et Publiés Pour la Société de l'histoire* de France, ed. by Eugène de Certain (Paris: Jules Renouard, 1858).

Anonymi Gesta Francorum, ed. by Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 1890).

'The Anonymous Ordene de chevalerie', in *Utrecht Publications in General and Comparative Literature*, vol. 17, ed. by Keith Busby (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1983).

Anselm of Lucca, 'S. Anselmus Lucensis Episcopus.', in *Victoris III Romani Pontificis, Sancti Anselmi Lucensis, opera omnia*, *PL*, 149, pp. 445–643.

Augustine, *Seventeen Short Treatises of S. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo*, trans. by Henry Browne (Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1847).

—— 'Epistola CXXXVIII.' in *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Opera Omnia post Lovaniensium Theologorum Recensionem, PL*, 33, Jacques-Paul Migne's Patrologia Latina, published in Paris, vol 2, pp. 525–35.

—— *The City of God*, trans. by Henry Bettenson, 2nd edn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984).

—— *Confessions*, trans. by Henry Chadwick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

—— *Against the Academicians and the Teacher*, trans. by Peter King (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 1995).

—— *On Christian Teaching*, trans. by Roger P. H. Green (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

—— 'Responses to Miscellaneous Questions: Part I- Books, Volume 12', in *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, trans. by Boniface Ramsay (New York: New City Press, 2008).

Balderic of Florennes, 'Gesta Alberonis Archiepiscopi Auctore Balderico', in *Monumenta Germaniae historica Scriptores in folio et quarto*, vol. 8, ed. by Georg Waitz (Hannover: Impensis bibliopolii Avlici Hahniani, 1851).

—— 'A Warrior Bishop of the Twelfth Century: The Deeds of Albero of Trier, by Balderich', in *Medieval Sources in Translation*, vol. 44, trans. by Brian A. Pavlac (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studie, 2008).

Baldric of Bourgueil, *Baldricus Burgulianus Carmina*, ed. by Karlheinz Hilbert (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1979).

—— *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil*, ed. by Steven Biddlecombe (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2014).

Bede, 'Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People', *Oxford Medieval Texts*, ed. by Bertram Colgrave and Roger A. B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969).

Benedict of Peterborough [attributed], 'Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi et Gesta Regis Ricardi Benedicti abbatis', in *Rolls Series,* vol. 49, ed. by William Stubbs, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1867).

Bernard of Clairvaux, 'Epistola XCVIII.', in *Sancti Bernardi Abbatis Primi Claræ-vallensis et Opera Omnia, PL*, 182, vol 2, pp. 230–234.

—— *The Letters of Bernard of Clairvaux*, trans. by Bruno S. James (London: Burns and Oates, 1953).

—— *Sancti Bernardi opera*, ed. by Jacques Leclercq, H. M. Rochais and C. H. Talbot, 8 vols (Rome: Cisterciensis, 1957–1977).

—— 'The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux: Treatises III: On Grace and Free Choice. In Praise of the New Knighthood', in *Cistercian Studies*, vol. 3, trans. by Daniel O' Donovan (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1977).

Jessalynn Bird, Edward Peters and James M. Powell (eds.), *Crusade and Christendom: Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187–1291* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

Boethius, *Boethius's De topicis differentiis*, trans. by Elenore Stump (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978).

Caesar, *Seven Commentaries on the Gallic Wars*, trans. Carolyn Hammond (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

La Chanson d'Antioche, *The Old French Crusade Cycle*, vol. 4, ed. by Jan Nelson (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1992).

La Chanson de Jérusalem, *The Old French Crusade Cycle*, vol. 6, ed. by Nigel R. Thorp (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1992).

Chronica Monasterii Casinensis, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*, vol. 34, ed. by Hartmut Hoffman (Hannover: Hahn, 1980).

Chroniques D'Anjou, *Recueillies Et Publiées pour la Société de l'Histoire de France*, 2 vols, ed. by Paul Marchegay and André Salmon (Paris: J. Renouard, 1865).

Cicero, 'Cicero, On the Orator: Books 1–2', *Loeb Classical Library*, vol. 348, trans. by Edward William Sutton and Harris Rackman (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948).

—— 'Cicero, On the Orator: Book 3. On Fate. Stoic Paradoxes. Divisions of Oratory', in *Loeb Classical Library*, vol. 349, trans. by Harris Rackman (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948).

—— 'Cicero, On Invention. The Best Kind of Orator. Topics', in *Loeb Classical Library*, vol. 386, trans. by Harry Mortimer Hubbell (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949).

—— 'Cicero, Brutus, Orator', in *Loeb Classical Library*, vol. 342, trans. by Harry Mortimer Hubbell and George Lincoln Hendrickson (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962).

Cicero (attributed), 'Rhetorica ad Herennium', in *Loeb Classical Library*, vol. 403, trans. by Henry Caplan (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954).

Conon de Béthune, 'Les Chansons de Conon de Béthune', in *Classiques français dy moyen âge*, ed. by Axel Wallensköld (Paris: Champion, 1921).

The Conquest of Lisbon: De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi, *Records of Western Civilization Series*, ed. by Charles W. David, with a new foreword by Jonathan Phillips (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2001).

The Councils of Urban II, Volume 1: Decreta Claromontensia, *Annuarium Historiae Concilioruin, Internationale Zeitschrift für Konziliengeschichtsforschung, Supplementum 1*, ed. by Robert Somerville (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1972).

The Deeds of Pope Innocent III by an Anonymous Author, trans. by James M. Powell (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2007).

Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation and Commentary, ed. by H. J. Schroeder (St. Louis, MO: B. Herder, 1937).

Eadmer, *The Life of St. Anselm Archbishop of Canterbury by Eadmer*, ed. by Richard W. Southern (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).

Einhard, *Charlemagne's Courtier: The Complete Einhard, Readings in Medieval Civilizations and Cultures*, ed. by Paul E. Dutton (Ontario: Broadview Press, 1998).

English Translation of the Holy Quran, ed. by Zahid Aziz (Wembley: Ahmadiyya Anjuman Lahore Publications, 2010).

Fulcher of Chartres, *Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia Hierosolymitana (1095–1127)*, ed. by Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 1913).

—— *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem 1095–1127*, ed. by Harold S. Fink, trans. Frances Rita Ryan (Knoxville, TN: University of Knoxville, 1969).

Geoffrey Malaterra, 'De rebus gestis Rogerii Calabriae et Siciliae comitis et Roberti Guiscardi ducis fratris eius', in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores 5*, vol. 1, ed. byErnesto Pontieri (Bologna: N. Zanichelli, 1928).

—— *The Deeds of Count Roger of Calabria and Sicily and of His Brother Duke Robert Guiscard*, trans. by Kenneth B. Wolf (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2005).

—— 'The History of the Kings of Britain: An Edition and Translation of De gestis Britonum [Historia Regum Britanniae]', in *Arthurian Studies*, ed. by Michael D. Reeve, trans. by Neil Wright (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2007).

Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La conquête de Constantinople, by Geoffrey of Villehardouin*, 2 vols, ed. by Edmond Faral (Paris: Edité par Les Belles Lettres, 1961).

Gerald of Wales, 'Giraldi Cambrensis Opera', in *8 vols, Rolls Series*, vol. 22, ed. by John S. Brewer, J. F. Dimock and George F. Warner (London: Longman, 1861–1891).

—— 'Expugnatio Hibernica: The Conquest of Ireland by Giraldus Cambrensis', in *New History of Ireland*, ed. by A. Brian Scott and Francis X. Martin (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1978).

—— *The History and Topography of Ireland*, trans. by John J. O'Meara (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982).

Gervase of Canterbury, 'The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury', in *Rolls Series,* vol. 73, 2 vols, ed. by William Stubbs (London, 1879–1880).

'Gesta Francorum: The Deeds of the Franks and the other Pilgrims to Jerusalem', in *Oxford Medieval Texts*, ed. by Rosalind Hill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).

Gildas, *Gildas, The Ruin of Britain and other works*, ed. by Michael Winterbottom (Chichester: Phillimore, 1978).

Gilo of Paris, 'The Historia vie Hierosolimitane of Gilo of Paris and a Second, Anonymous Author', *Oxford Medieval Texts*, ed. by Christopher W. Grocock and Elizabeth Siberry (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

Gregory III, 'Gregorii VIII Papæ Epistolæ et Privilegia', *Opera Omnia Urbani III, Gregorii VIII, Romanorum Pontificum Epistolae et Privilegia*, PL, vol. 202, 1539–1542.

Guibert of Nogent, *Self and Society in Medieval France; The Memoirs of Guibert of Nogent (1064? –c. 1125)*, ed. by John F. Benton, trans. by Charles C. Swinton Bland (New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1970).

—— 'Guibert de Nogent Dei gesta per Francos et cinq autres textes', *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 127A, ed. by Robert B. C. Huygens (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996).

—— *The Deeds of God through the Franks: A Translation of Guibert de Nogent's 'Gesta Dei per Francos'*, trans. by Robert Levine (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997).

Ernest F. Henderson (ed. and trans.), *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1896).

Henri de Marcy, 'Domni Henrici Clarævallensis quondam Abbatis Postmodum Albanensis Episcopi Epistolæ', in *Clementis III Pontificis Romani Epistolæ Et Privilegia: Ordine Chronologico Digesta, PL*, p. 204.

Henry of Huntingdon, 'Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon: Historia Anglorum: The History of the English People', in *Oxford Medieval Texts*, ed. by Diana E. Greenway (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

Helmold of Bosau, 'Helmoldi, presbyteri, Cronica Slavorum recensione I.M. Lappenbergii in usum schlolarum ex monumentis germaniae historicis', in *Scriptores rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum ex Monumenta germania historicio separatim editi*, vol. 31, ed. by Georg Heinrich Pertz (Hannover: Impensis bibliopolii Hahniani, 1868).

—— 'The Chronicle of the Slavs, by Helmold, Priest of Bosau', *Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies*, vol. 21, trans. by Francis J. Tschan (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1935).

Histoire anonyme de la première croisade, *Les Classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Âge*, vol. 4, ed. and trans. by Louis Bréhier (Paris: Champion, 1924).

'Historia de expeditione Friderici I imperatoris' in Anton Chroust (ed.), 'Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I: Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris et quidam alii rerum gestarum fontes eiusdem expeditionis', in *Monumenta Germaniae historica scriptores rerum Germanicarum nova series*, vol. 5 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), pp. 1–115.

'Historia de expeditione Friderici I imperatoris' in Anton Chroust (ed.), *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa: The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick and Related Texts*, trans. Graham A. Loud (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

'Historia Peregrinorum' in Anton Chroust (ed.), 'Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I: Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris et quidam alii rerum gestarum fontes eiusdem expeditionis', in *Monumenta Germaniae historica scriptores rerum Germanicarum nova series*, vol. 5 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), pp. 116–72.

Homer, *The Iliad of Homer*, trans. by Richmond Lattimore (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1951).

Horace, 'Horace; Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica', in *Loeb Classical Library*, vol. 194, trans. by Henry R. Fairclough (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929).

Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusolymarum (olim Tudebodus imitatus et continuatus): I Normanni d'Italia alla prima Crociata in una cronaca cassinese, ed. by Edoardo D'Angelo (Florence, 2009).

Innocent III, 'Innocentii III Romani Pontificus Regestorum Sive Epistolarum Liber XVI. XXVIII universis christi fidelibus per maguntinensem provinciam constitutes. De negotio terræ sanctæ –', in *Innocentii III Opera Omnia, PL, 216*, vol 3, pp. 817–822.

—— *Die Register Innocenz' III*, 8 vols, ed. by Othmar Hageneder and Anton Haidacher (Graz-Cologne, Verlag der österreichischen Akademieder Wissenschaften, 1964–2001).

Independence Day, DVD, directed by Roland Emmerich (Los Angeles, CA, 1996).

Ivo of Chartres, 'Decretum', in *Sancti Ivonis Carnotensis Episcopi Opera Omnia, PL*, 161, vol 1, pp. 9–1037.

Das Itinerarium Peregrinorum. 'Eine zeitgenössische englische Chronik zum dritten Kreuzzug in ursprünglicher Gestalt', in *Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae historica*, vol. 18, ed. by Hans E. Mayer (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1962).

The Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi; 'Auctore, ut Videtur, Ricardo, Canonico Sanctæ Trinitatis Londoniensis, Chronicles and Memorials of

the Reign of Richard I', in *Rolls Series,* vol. 38, 2 vols, ed. by William Stubbs (London: Longman, 1864–1865).

The Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi. 'The Chronicle of the Third Crusade: A Translation of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum Et Gesta Regis Ricardi', *Crusade Texts in Translation*, vol. 3, trans. by Helen Nicholson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997).

James Boswell, *Boswell's Life of Johnson: The Life (1709–1765)*, ed. by George B. Hill, revised by Lawrence F. Powell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).

John of Salisbury. *The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury: A Twelfth-Century Defense of the Verbal and Logical Arts of the Trivium*, trans. by Daniel D. McGarry (Berkley: University of California Press, 1955).

Josephus, *Josephus in Nine Volumes. II. The Jewish War, Books I-III*, 9 volumes, ed. by Henry St. John Thackeray (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926).

'Libellus de expugnatione terrae sanctae per Saladinum' in Joseph Stephenson (ed.), 'Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon anglicanum, De expugnatione Terrae Sanctae libellus; Thomas Agnellus De morte et sepultura Henrici regis Angliae junioris; Gesta Fulconis filii Warini; Excerpta ex Otiis imperialibus Gervasii Tilebutiensis', in *Rolls Series*, vol. 66 (London: Longman, 1875), pp. 209–62.

Liber Eliensis, *Camden Society Series 3*, vol. 92, ed. by Ernest O. Blake (London, 1962).

—— *A History of the Isle of Ely from the Seventh to the Twelfth Century*, trans. by Janet Fairweather (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2005).

Lisiard of Tours, *Lisiardus Turonensis Clericus Historia Hierosolymitana*, PL, vol. 174, pp. 1589–1634.

The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King, DVD, directed by Peter Jackson (Burbank, CA, 2003).

Lucan, 'The Civil War', in *Loeb Classical Library*, vol. 220, trans. by James D. Duff (Cambridge, MA, 1928).

Martianus Capella, *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts: Volume II, The Marriage of Philology and Mercury*, trans. by William H. Stahl, Richard Johnson and Evan L. Burge (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1977).

Maximus of Turin, 'Homilia CXIV', in *Sancti Maximi episcopi taurinensis Opera omnia*, *PL*, p. 57.

Nicholas of Clairvaux, 'Nicholai Claræ-Vallensis in persona S. Bernardi – Epistola CDLXVII (1125)', in *Sancti Bernardi Abbatis Primi Claræ-vallensis et Opera Omnia, PL*, vol. 182, vol 2, pp. 671–2.

Odo of Deuil, *De Profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem: the Journey of Louis VII to the East*, ed. and trans. by Virginia G. Berry (New York, NY: W. W. Norton, 1948).

De Oorkonden der graven van Vlaanderen (Juli 1128–September 1191), ed. by Thérèse de Hemptinne, Adriaan Verhulst and Lieve De Me, 2nd edn (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 2001).

Orderic Vitalis, 'Orderici Vitalis Historia Æcclesiastica. The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis', in *Oxford Medieval Texts*, 6 vols, ed. by Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968–1980).

Otto of Freising and Rahewin, Waitz, 'Ottonis et Rahewini Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris', in *Monumenta Germaniae historica Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi*, vol. 96, ed. by Georg Waitz and Bernhard von Simson (Hannover: Hahn, 1912).

—— *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa by Otto of Freising and His Continuator, Rahewin*, trans. by Charles Christopher Mierow (New York, NY: Norton, 1966).

Patton, DVD, Directed by Franklin J. Schaffner (Beverly Hills, CA, 1970).

Peter of Blois, 'Passio Reginaldi principis Antiocheni', in *Petri Blesensis Bathoniensis in Anglia Archdiaconi Opera Omnia, PL*, p. 207.

Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay, 'Petri Vallium Sarnaii monachi Historia Albigensis', *Société de l'Histoie de France Série antérieure à 1789*, 3 vols, ed. by Pascal Guébin and Ernest Lyon (Paris: Champion, 1926–1939).

—— *History of the Albigensian Crusade: Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay's 'Historia Albigensis'*, trans. by W. A. Sibly and M. D. Sibly (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998).

Peter the Venerable, *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, 2 vols, ed. by Giles Constable (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967).

Peter Tudebode, 'Peter Tudebode: Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere', in *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 101, trans. by John H. Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1974).

—— 'Petrus Tudebodus: Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere', *Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades*, vol. 12, ed. by John H. Hill & Laurita L. Hill (Paris: Geuthner, 1977).

Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, 4 vols, trans. Harold Edgeworth Butler (London: William Heinemann, 1920–1922).

Rabanus Maurus, 'Enarrationum In Epistolas Beati Pauli Liber XXIII – Expositio in epistolam I ad Timotheum', in *B. Rabani Mauri Fuldensis Abbatis Et Moguntini Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia*, *PL*, 112, vol 6, pp. 580–635.

Ralph of Caen, *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade*, trans. by Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach (Farnham: Ashgate, 2005).

—— 'Radulphi Cadomensis Tancredus', in *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis*, vol. 231, ed. by Edoardo D'Angelo (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011).

Ralph of Coggeshall, 'Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon anglicanum, De expugnatione Terrae Sanctae libellus; Thomas Agnellus De morte et sepultura Henrici regis Angliae junioris; Gesta Fulconis filii Warini; Excerpta ex Otiis imperialibus Gervasii Tilebutiensis', in *Rolls Series*, vol. 66, ed. by Joseph Stephenson (London: Longman, 1875), pp. 1–208.

Raymond of Aguilers, 'Le "Liber" de Raymond d'Aguilers', in *Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades*, vol. 9, ed. by John H. Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Paris: Geuthner, 1969).

Richard of Devizes, 'Cronicon Richardi Divisensis de Tempore Regis Richardi Primi, The Chronicle of Richard of Devizes of the Time of King Richard the First', in *Nelson Medieval Texts*, ed. by John T. Appleby (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1963).

Robert the Monk, 'Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade – Historia Iherosolimitana', in *Crusade Texts in Translation*, vol. 11, trans. by Carol Sweetenham (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).

—— *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, ed. by Marcus G. Bull and Damien Kempf (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013).

Roger of Howden, 'Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene', in *Rolls Series,* vol. 51, 4 vols, ed. by William Stubbs (London: Longman, 1868–1871).

Rotuli de liberate ac de misis et praestitis, regnante Johanne, ed. by Thomas D. Hardy (London: Record Commission, 1844).

Rotuli Normanniae, ed. by Thomas D. Hardy (London: Record Commission, 1835).

Rufinus, *Die Summa Decretorum Des Magister Rufinus*, ed. Heinrich Singer (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1902).

Sallust, *The Jugurthine War/The Conspiracy of Catiline*, trans. by Stanley A. Handford (Middlesex: Penguin, 1987).

—— 'C. Sallusti Crispi: Catalina, Ivgvrtha, Historiavm Fragmenta Selecta, Appendix Sallvstiana', in *Oxford Classical Texts*, ed. by Leighton D. Reynolds (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Sulpicius Severus, 'Sulpice Sévère. Vie de saint Martin', in *Série des Textes Monastiques d'Occident, Sources Chrétiennes,* vol. 133, 3 vols, ed. Jacques Fontaine (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1967–1969).

—— *Early Christian Lives*, trans. by Carolinne White (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1998).

Tacitus, 'Agricola', in *Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics*, ed. by Anthony J. Woodman with C. S. Kraus (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

—— *Agricola and Germany*, trans. by Anthony Richard Birley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Thierry of Chartres, 'The Latin Rhetorical Commentaries by Thierry of Chartres', in *Studies and Texts*, vol. 84, ed. by Karin M. Fredborg (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1988).

Thietmar of Merseburg, *Ottonian Germany: The Chronicon of Thietmar of Merseburg*, ed. by David A. Warner (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001).

Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts, ed. by James J. Murphy (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1971).

Vegetius, 'Vegetius: Epitome of Military Science', in *Translated Texts for Historians*, 2nd edn, trans. by N. P. Milner (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011).

Virgil, *The Aeneid*, trans. by William F. J. Knight (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1956).

—— 'Virgil, Vol. II: Aeneid: Books 7–12. Appendix Vergiliana', in *Loeb Classical Library*, vol. 64, trans. by Henry Rushton Fairclough and George P. Goold (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000).

Walter the Chancellor, 'Galterii, cancellarii Antiocheni, Bella Antiochena, 1114–1119', in *Recueil des historiens des croisades: Historiens occidentaux*, vol. 5 (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1895), pp. 81–132.

Walter Daniel, 'The Life of Aelred of Rievaulx by Walter Daniel', in *Oxford Medieval Texts*, ed. by Frederick M. Powicke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).

William of Jumiéges, 'The Gesta Normannorum ducum of William of Jumiéges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni', in *Oxford Medieval Texts*, 2 vols, ed. by Elizabeth van Houts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

William of Newburgh, *William of Newburgh: The History of English Affairs, Book 1*, ed. by Peter G. Walsh and Michael J. Kennedy (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1988).

William of Malmesbury, 'Gesta Pontificum Anglorum: The History of the English Bishops, Vol. 1: Text and Translation', in *Oxford Medieval Texts*, ed. by Michael Winterbottom and Rodney M. Thomson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

—— 'William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum, The History of the English Kings', in *Oxford Medieval Texts*, 2 vols, ed. by Roger A. B. Mynors, Rodney M. Thomson and Michael Winterbottom (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).
William of Poitiers, *Histoire de Guillaume le Conquérant*, ed. by Raymonde Foreville (Paris: Belles-lettres, 1952).
—— 'The Gesta Gvillelmi of William of Poitiers', in *Oxford Medieval Texts*, ed. by Ralph H. C. Davis and Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
William of Tyre, 'Willemi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon', in *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis*, vol. 63–63A, ed. by Robert B. C. Huygens, Hans Eberhard Mayer and Gerhard Rösch (Turnhout: Brepols, 1986).
William the Breton, *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume Le Breton, historiens de Philippe-Auguste Chroniques de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton, Tome Premire*, ed. by Henri-François Delaborde, 2 vols (Paris: Société de l'histoire de. France, 1882–1885).
'The Winchcombe and Coventry Chronicles: Hitherto Unnoticed Witnesses to the Work of John of Worcester', in *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies*, 2 vols, ed. by Paul A. Hayward (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2010).
Xenophon, *The Education of Cyrus*, trans. by Wayne Ambler (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001).

Secondary Sources

Achille Luchaire, *Social France at the Time of Philip Augustus*, trans. by Edward Benjamin Krehbiel (New York: Harper and Row, 1967).
Adrian Cornell du Houx, *Journeys to Holiness: Lay Sanctity in the Central Middle Ages*, *c*. 970–*c*. 1120 (unpublished PhD Thesis, Lancaster University, 2015).
Aelred Squire, *Aelred of Rievaulx: A Study*, Cistercian Studies, 2nd edn (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1981).
Alan V. Murray, 'Voices of Flanders: Orality and Constructed Orality in the Chronicle of Galbert of Bruges', *Handelingen der Maatschappij voor Geschiedenis en Oudheidkunde te Gent n.s.*, 48 (1994), pp. 103–19.
—— ' "Mighty Against the Enemies of Christ": The Relic of the True Cross in the Armies of the Kingdom of Jerusalem', in *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*, ed. by John France and William G. Zajac (Farnham: Ashgate, 1998), pp. 217–38.
—— 'National Identity, Language and Conflict in the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1096–1192', in *The Crusades and the Near East: Cultural Histories*, ed. by Conor Kostick (London: Routledge, 2010), pp. 107–30.
Alan J. Forey, 'The Second Crusade: Scope and Objectives', *Durham University Journal*, vol. 86 (1994), pp. 165–75.
—— 'The Siege of Lisbon and the Second Crusade', *Portuguese Studies*, 20 (2004), pp. 1–13.
Andrew Jotischky, *Crusading and the Crusader States* (Harlow: Longman, 2004).
Andrew MacDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland: Challenges to the Canmore Kings, 1058–1266* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2003).
Anders Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's Decretum*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, Fourth Series, 49 (Cambridge, 2000).

Andrei G. Zavaliy and Michael Aristidou, 'Courage: A Modern Look at an Ancient Virtue', *Journal of Military Ethics*, 13: 2 (2014), pp. 174–89.

Anne Curry, 'The Battle Speeches of Henry V', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 34 (2008), pp. 77–98.

Anne J. Duggan, 'The Making of a Myth: Giraldus Cambrensis, *Laudabiliter*, and Henry II's Lordship of Ireland', in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 3rd Series, 4, ed. by Joel T. Rosenthal and Paul E. Szarmach (2007), pp. 107–70.

—— 'Justinian's Laws, not the Lord's': Eugenius III and the learned laws', in *Pope Eugenius III (1145–1153): The First Cistercian Pope*, ed. by Iben Fonnesberg-Schmidt and Andrew Jotischky, Church Faith and Culture in the Medieval West (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018), pp. 27–68.

Bennett D. Hill, *English Cistercian Monasteries and Their Patrons in the Twelfth Century* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968).

Bernard S. Bachrach, *Fulk Nerra, the Neo-Roman Consul, 987–1040: A Political Biography of an Angevin Count* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

—— 'Writing Latin History for a Lay Audience *c.* 1000: Dudo of Saint Quentin at the Norman Court', in *The Haskins Society Journal 20: 2008 Studies in Medieval History*, ed. by William North (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2009), pp. 58–77.

Bernard Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West* (London: Edward Arnold, 1986).

—— *The Leper King and His Heirs: Baldwin IV and the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Bernard J. D. van Vreeswijk, 'Interpreting Anselm's Thought about Divine Justice: Dealing with Loose Ends', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 69: 4 (2016), pp. 417–31.

Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952).

—— 'Sallust in the Middle Ages', in *Classical Influence on European Culture AD 500–1500*, ed. by Robert R. Bolgar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 165–76.

—— *Historians in the Middle Ages* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1974).

Beverly M. Kienzle, 'Preaching the Cross: Liturgy and Crusade Propaganda', *Medieval Sermon Studies*, 53 (2009), pp. 11–46.

Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050–1300* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964).

Carl Erdmann, *The Origin and Idea of Crusade*, trans. by Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977).

Cecilia M. Gaposchkin, 'From Pilgrimage to Crusade: The Liturgy of Departure, 1095–1300', *Speculum*, 88: 1 (2013), pp. 44–91.

Christopher R. Cheney, 'English Cistercian Libraries: The First Century', in Christopher R. Cheny, *Medieval Texts and Studies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp. 328–49.

—— *Pope Innocent III and England* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1976).

Christopher J. Tyerman (Chicago, MI: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

—— 'Were There Any Crusades in the Twelfth Century?', *English Historical Review*, 110 (1995), pp. 553–77.

—— *The Invention of the Crusades* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1998).

—— *The Debate on the Crusades 1099–2010* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011).

—— 'Commoners on Crusade: The Creating of Political Space?', *English Historical Review*, 136 (2021), pp. 245–75.

Christopher H. MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East: Rough Tolerance* (Philedelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).

Colin Morris, 'Policy and Visions: The Case of the Holy Lance at Antioch', in *War and Government in the Middle Ages: essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich*, ed. by John Gillingham and James C. Holt (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1984), pp. 33–45.

—— *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050 to 1250*, Oxford History of the Christian Church (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

—— 'The *Gesta Francorum* as Narrative History', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 19 (1993), pp. 55–71.

—— *The Sepulchre of Christ and the Medieval West: From the Beginning to 1600* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

'Colonel wins libel damages', *BBC News*, 2 April 2004, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/northern_ireland/3593027.stm (accessed 26 September 2018).

Conor Kostick, *The Social Structure of the First Crusade*, The Medieval Mediterranean: Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400–1500 (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

—— 'A Further Discussion on the Authorship of the *Gesta Francorum*', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 35 (2009), pp. 1–14.

Constance B. Bouchard, 'Family Structure and Family Consciousness among the Aristocracy in the Ninth to Eleventh Centuries', *Francia*, 14 (1986), pp. 639–58.

—— *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980–1198* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987).

Damien Kempf, 'Towards a Textual Archaeology of the First Crusade', in *Writing the Early Crusades, Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. by Damien Kempf and Marcus G. Bull (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2014), pp. 116–26.

Daniel Roach, 'Orderic Vitalis and the First Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, 42: 2 (2016), pp. 177–201.

David S. Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility: Clerical Representation of Battlefield Orations against Muslims, 1080–1170', *The International History Review*, 26: 1 (2004), pp. 1–19.

David Townsend, 'Anglo-Latin Hagiography and the Norman Transition', *Exemplaria*, 3 (1991), pp. 385–433.

Deborah Gerish, 'The True Cross and the Kings of Jerusalem', *Haskins Society Journal*, 8 (1996), pp. 137–55.

Denys Pringle, 'The Spring of the Cresson in Crusading History', in *Dei gesta per Francos: Etudes sur les croisades dediees a Jean Richard*, ed. by Michel Balard, Benjamin Z. Kedar and Jonathan Riley-Smith (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 231–40.

Dexter Filkins, 'Hezbola Widens the Syrian War', *The New Yorker*, 26 May 2013, https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/hezbollah-widens-the-syrian-war (accessed 29 September 2017).

Dom D. Knowles, 'The Case of Saint William of York', *Cambridge Historical Journals*, 5: 2 (1936), pp. 163–77.

Duncan Robertson, *Lectio Divina: The Medieval Experience of Reading* (Collegeville, MN: Cistercian Publications, 2011).

Edmund King, *The Anarchy of Stephen's Reign* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
Elizabeth Freeman, *Narratives of a New Order: Cistercian Historical Writing in England, 1150–1220*, Medieval Church Studies, vol. 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002).
Elizabeth Keitel, 'Homeric Antecedents to the *Cohoratio* in the Ancient Historians', *The Classical World*, 80 (1987), pp. 153–72.
Elizabeth Lapina, *The Miraculous in the Chronicles of the First Crusade* (Centre County, PA: Penn State University Press, 2015).
Emily Albu, *The Normans in their Histories: Propaganda, Myth, and Subversion* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2001).
Fenwick Jones and George Fenwick, *The Ethos of the Song of Roland* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1963).
Franco Cardini, 'The Warrior and the Knight', in *The Medieval World*, ed. by Jacques Le Goff, trans. by Lydia C. Cochrane (London: Collins & Brown, 1990), pp. 75–95.
Frederick H. Russell, *Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).
Frederick M. Warren, 'The Enamoured Moslem Princess in Orderic Vital and the French Epic', *PMLAA*, 29: 3 (1914a), pp. 341–58.
—— 'The Battle of Fraga and Larchamp in Orderic Vital', *Modern Philology*, 11: 3 (1914b), pp. 339–46.
Geoffrey W. H. Lampe (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible. Vol: II: The West from the Fathers to the Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).
George Duby, *The Legend of Bouvines: War, Religion and Culture in the Middle Ages*, trans. by Catherine Tihanyi (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 1990).
Gerald A. Bond, '*Iocus Amoris*: The Poetry of Baudri of Bourgueil and the Formation of the Ovidian Subculture', *Traditio*, 42 (1986).
Gerda Heydemann, 'The Orator as Exegete: Cassiodorus as a Reader of the Psalms', in *Reading the Bible in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Jinty Nelson and Damien Kempf, Studies in Early Medieval History (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), pp. 19–42.
Gerd Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*, trans. by R. F. Bennett (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1940).
Giles Constable, 'The Ceremonies and Symbolism of Entering Religious Life and Taking the Monastic Habit, from the Fourth to the Twelfth Century', in *Segni e riti nella chiesa altomedievale occidentale, 11–17 aprile 1985, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, vol. 33 (Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, 1987), pp. 771–834.
—— *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
Giles Constable, 'The Second Crusade as Seen by Contemporaries', in *Crusaders and Crusading in the Twelfth Century*, ed. by Giles Constable (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 229–300.
Glenn Olsen, 'The Idea of the Ecclesia Primitiva in the Writings of the Twelfth-Century Canonists', *Traditio*, 25 (1969), pp. 61–86.
Hans Mayer, *The Crusades*, trans. by John Gillingham (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972).

Hannes Möhring, 'Eine Chronik aus der Zeit des Dritten Kreuzzugs: das sogenannte *Itinerarium peregrinorum* 1', *Innsbrucker historische Studien*, 5 (1982), pp. 149–62.

Hans Oehler, 'Studien zu den Gesta Francorum', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*, 6 (1970), pp. 58–97.

Harold V. Livermore, 'The Conquest of Lisbon' and Its Author', *Portuguese Studies*, 6 (1990), pp. 1–16.

Hastings Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages: Volume 1: Salerno, Bologna, Paris*, ed. by Frederick M. Powicke and Alfred B. Emden (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936).

Helen J. Nicholson, 'The Construction of a Primary Source: The Creation of Itinerarium Peregrinorum 1', *Cahiers de Recherches Medieval et Humanistes*, 37: 1 (2019), pp. 143–65.

—— *Templars, Hospitallers and Teutonic Knights: Images of the Military Orders, 1128–1291* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1993).

Herbert E. J. Cowdrey, 'Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade', *History*, 55 (1970), pp. 177–88.

—— 'The Mahdia Campaign of 1087', *English Historical Review*, 92 (1977).

—— 'Canon Law and the First Crusade', in *The Horns of Hattin*: *proceedings of the Second Conference of the Society for the study of the Crusades and the Latin East, Jerusalem and Haifa 2–6 July, 1987*, ed. by Benjamin Z. Kedar (Jerusalem & London, Yad Izhak BenZvi /Israel Exploration Society & Variorum, 1992).

—— 'The Reform Papacy and the Origin of the Crusades', in *Le concile de Clermont de 1095 et l'appel à la croisade: actes du Colloque universitaire international de Clermont-Ferrand, 23–25 juin 1995* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1997), pp. 65–83.

Horst Richer, '*Militia Dei*: A Central Concept for the Religious Idea of the Early Crusades and the German Rolandslied', in *Journeys towards God: Pilgrimage and Crusade*, ed. by Barbara N. Sargent-Baur, Studies in Medieval Culture (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 1992), pp. 107–26.

Ian S. Robinson, 'Gregory VII and the Soldiers of Christ', *History*, 58 (1973), pp. 169–92.

—— 'Innocent II and the Empire', in *Pope Innocent II (1130–1143): The World vs. The City*, ed. by John Doran and Damian J. Smith (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), pp. 27–68.

James A. Brundage, 'A Transformed Angel: The Problem of the Crusading Monk', in *Studies in Medieval Cistercian History Presented to Jeremiah F. O'Sullivan*, ed. by J. F. O'Callaghan, Cistercian Studies Series, 13 (Spencer, MA: Cistercian Publication, 1971), pp. 55–62.

—— 'The Hierarchy of Violence in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Canonists', *The International History Review*, 17: 4 (1995), pp. 670–92.

James H. Kane, 'Wolf's Hair, Exposed Digits, and Muslim Holy Men: The *Libellus de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum* and the *Conte* of Ernoul', *Viator*, 47: 2 (2016), pp. 95–112.

—— 'The Impact of the Cross on Western Crusade Terminology, *c.* 1095–1250' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2016).

James MacGregor, 'The Ministry of Gerold d'Avranches: Warrior Saints and Knightly Piety on the Eve of the First Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, 29: 3 (2003), pp. 219–37.

James Mattis, 'A Marine's Letter to His Troops', *Dallas Morning News*, 21 March 2004.

James J. Murphy, 'Saint Augustine and the Debate about a Christian Rhetoric', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 46: 4 (1960), pp. 400–10.

—— 'Cicero's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 53 (1967), pp. 334–41.

—— *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of the Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (London: University of California Press, 1981).

—— *Medieval Rhetoric: A Selected Bibliography*, Toronto Medieval Bibliographies, vol. 3, 2nd edn (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989).

James Naus, 'The *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Robert the Monk and the Coronation of Louis VI', in *Writing the Early Crusades, Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. by Damien Kempf and Marcus G. Bull (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2014), pp. 105–15.

James Willoughby, 'A Templar Chronicle of the Third Crusade: Origin and Transmission', *Medium Aevum*, 81 (2012), pp. 126–34.

Jan F. Verbruggen, *The Art of Warfare in Western Europe During the Middle Ages from the Eighth Century to 1340*, trans. by Sumner Willard and Mrs. R. W. Southern 2nd edn (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1997).

Jay Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2002).

—— 'Putting History to Use: Three Crusade Chronicles in Context', *Viator*, 35 (2004), pp. 131–67.

—— 'What Is the *Gesta Francorum* and Who Was Peter Tudebode?', *Revue Mabillon*, 16 (2005), pp. 179–204.

—— 'Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres: Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect', in *Writing the Early Crusades, Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. by Damien Kempf and Marcus G. Bull (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2014), pp. 24–37.

Jean Dunbabin, 'Discovering a Past for the French Aristocracy', in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. by Paul Magdalino (London: Hambledon Press, 1992), pp. 1–14.

Jean Flori, 'Mort et martyre des guerriers vers 1100. L'Exemple de la première croisade', *Cahiers de Civilisation Médievale*, 34 (1991), pp. 121–39.

—— *Croisade et Chevalerie, XIe- XIIe siècles*, Bibliothèque du Moyen Âge, vol. 12 (Bruxelles: De Boeck, 1998).

Jean Leclerq, *Monks and Love in Twelfth-Century France: Psycho-Historical Essays* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

Jean Richard, *L'Esprit de la Croisade* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969).

Jennifer A. Harris, 'The Bible and the Meaning of History in the Middle Ages', in *The Practice of the Bible in the Middle Ages: Production, Reception, and Performance in Western Christianity*, ed. by Susan Boynton and Diane J. Reilly (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), pp. 84–104.

Jennifer Paxton, 'Textual Communities in the English Fenlands: A Lay Audience for Monastic Chronicles?', in *Anglo-Norman Studies 26: Proceedings of the Battle*

Conference 2003, ed. by John Gillingham (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2004), pp. 123–37.

Jessalynn Bird, 'Reform or Crusade? Anti-Usury and Crusade Preaching During the Pontificate of Innocent III', in *Pope Innocent III and His World*, ed. by John C. Moore (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), pp. 165–85.

Jessalynn Bird. 'The Victorines, Peter the Chanter's Circle, and the Crusade: Two Unpublished Crusading Appeals in Paris, Bibliothe`que Nationale, Ms. Latin 14470', *Medieval Sermon Studies*, 48 (2004), pp. 5–28.

Johannes Hahn, 'The Veneration of the Maccabean Brothers in Fourth Century Antioch: Religious Competition, Martyrdom and Innovation', in *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old Testament Faith Warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in Historical Perspective* ed. by Gabriela Signori, Brill Studies in Intellectual History, vol. 203 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 79–104.

John A. Alford, 'The Scriptural Self', in *The Bible in the Middle Ages: Its Influence on Literature and Art*, ed. by Bernard S. Levy, Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, vol. 89 (Binghamton, NY: MRTS, 1992), pp. 1–21.

John F. Benton, '*Nostre Franceis n'unt talent de fuir*': The Song of Roland and the Enculturation of a Warrior Class', *Olifant*, 6 (1979), pp. 237–58.

John R. E. Bliese, 'The Study of Rhetoric in the Twelfth Century', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 63: 4 (1977), pp. 364–83.

—— 'Aelred of Rievaulx's Rhetoric and Morale at the Battle of the Standard, 1138', *Albion*, 20: 4 (1988), pp. 543–56.

—— 'Rhetoric and Morale: A Study of Battle Orations from the central middle ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 15 (1989), pp. 201–26.

—— 'The Courage of the Normans—A Comparative Study of Battle Rhetoric', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 35 (1991a), pp. 1–26.

—— 'The Just War as Concept and Motive in the Central Middle Ages', in *Medievalia Et Humanistica: Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Culture, New Series – Number 17*, ed. by Paul Maurice Clogan (Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1991b), pp. 1–14.

—— 'When Knightly Courage May Fail: Battle Orations in Medieval Europe', *The Historian*, 53: 3 (1991c).

—— 'Fighting Spirit and Literary Genre: A Comparison of Battle Exhortations in the 'Song of Roland' and in Chronicles of the Central Middle Ages', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 96: 4 (1995), pp. 417–36.

—— 'The Election and Title of Godfrey of Bouillon', *Canadian Journal of History*, 18 (1983), pp. 321–30.

John France, *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

—— 'The Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* and *the Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* of Raymond of Aguilers and *the Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere* of Peter Tudebode: An Analysis of the Textual Relationship between Primary Sources for the First Crusade', in *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*, ed. by John France and William G. Zajac (Farnham: Ashgate, 1998a), pp. 39–69.

—— 'The Use of the Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* in the Early Twelfth-Century Sources for the First Crusade', in *From Clermont to Jerusalem: The Crusades and Crusader Societies 1095–1500. Selected Proceedings of the International Medieval*

Congress, University of Leeds, 10–13 July 1995, ed. by Alan V. Murray, International Medieval Research, vol. 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), pp. 29–42.

John Gillingham, *Richard the Lionheart*, 2nd edn (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989).

John Halbrooks, 'Ælfric, the Maccabees, and the Problem of Christian Heroism', *Studies in Philology*, 106: 3 (2009), pp. 263–84.

John Helgeland, *Christians and the Military: The Early Experience* (Philadelphia, PA, 1985).

John Taylor, *Medieval Historical Writing in Yorkshire* (York: St. Anthony's Press, 1961).

John Moorhead, 'Iconoclasm, the Cross and the Imperial Image', *Byzantium*, 55 (1985), pp. 165–79.

John O. Ward, 'Classical Rhetoric and the Writing of History in Medieval and Renaissance Culture', in *European History and Its Historians*, ed. by Frank McGregor and Nicholas Wright (Adelaide: Adelaide University Union Press, 1977), pp. 1–10.

—— 'Some Principles of Rhetorical Historiography in the Twelfth Century', in *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography*, ed. by Ernst Breisach, Studies in Medieval Culture, vol. 19 (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications Western Michigan University, 1985), pp. 103–66.

John A. Watt, *The Theory of Papal Monarchy in the Thirteenth Century*: *The Contribution of the Canonists* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1965).

Jonathan Phillips, 'The Ideas of Crusade and Holy War in *De expugnatione Lyxbonesi* (The Conquest of Lisbon)', in *The Holy Land, Holy Lands and Christian History*, ed. by R. N. Swanson, Studies in Church History, 36 (Woodbridge: Ecclesiastical History Society, 2000), pp. 123–41.

—— *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom* (London: Yale University Press, 2010).

Jonathan Riley-Smith, 'Crusading as an Act of Love', *History*, 65 (1980), pp. 177–92.

Jonathan Phillips, *The Crusades, 1095–1197*, Seminar Studies in History (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013).

Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A Short History* (London: Athlone Press, 1987).

—— 'Family Traditions and Participation in the Second Crusade', in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, ed. by Michael Gervers (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1992), pp. 101–9.

—— *The First Crusaders, 1095–1131* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

—— *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 2nd edn (London: Continuum, 2009).

—— *What Were the Crusades?*, 4th edn (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Jonathan Riley-Smith and Louis Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality*, Documents of Medieval History, vol. 4 (London: Edward Arnold, 1981).

Joseph O'Callaghan, *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*, The Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003).

Julia C. Crick, 'Two Newly Located Manuscripts of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britannie*', *Arthurian Literature*, 13 (1995), pp. 151–6.

Jürgen Blänsdorf, 'Ancient Genres in the Poem of a Medieval Humanist: Intertextual Aspects of the "*De sufficientia votorum suorum*"(c. 126H.) of Baudri of Bourgueil (1046–1130)', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 2 (1995).

Katherine Breen, *Imagining an English Reading Public, 1150–1400* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Katherine A. Smith, 'Saints in Shining Armor: Martial Asceticism and Masculine Models of Sanctity, *ca*. 1050–1250', *Speculum*, 83: 3 (2008), pp. 572–602.

Keith Stringer, *Earl David of Huntingdon, 1152–1219: A Study in Anglo-Scottish history* (Edinburgh, 1985).

Keith Yellin, *Battle Exhortation: The Rhetoric of Combat Leadership* (Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 2008).

Kenneth Baxter Wolf, 'Crusade and Narrative: Bohemond and the *Gesta Francorum*', *Journal of Medieval History*, 17 (1991), pp. 207–16.

—— *Making History: The Normans and their Historians in Eleventh Century Italy* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995).

Ken Pennington, 'The Biography of Gratian, the Father of Canon Law', *Villanova Law Review*, 59 (2014), pp. 679–0.

Lars Kjær, 'Conquests, Family Traditions and the First Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, 45 (2019), pp. 553–79.

Lars B. Mortensen, 'The Glorious Past: Entertainment, Example or History? Levels of Twelfth-Century Historical Culture', *Culture and History*, 13 (1994), pp. 57–71.

—— 'The Texts and Contexts of Ancient Roman History in Twelfth-Century Western Scholarship', in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. by Paul Magdalino (London: Hambledon Press, 1992), pp. 99–116.

Laura Ashe, *Fiction and History in England, 1066–1200* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

—— 'The Ideal of Knighthood in English and French Writing, 1100–1230: Crusade, Piety, Chivalry and Patriotism', in *Writing the Early Crusades, Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. by Marcus G. Bull and Damien Kempf (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2014), pp. 155–68.

Léan Ní Chléirigh, '*Nova Peregrinatio*: The First Crusade as a Pilgrimage in Contemporary Latin Narratives', in *Writing the Early Crusades, Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. by Marcus G. Bull and Damien Kempf (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2014), pp. 63–74.

Leah Shopkow, *History and Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1997).

Leighton D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).

Luigi Russo, 'The Monte Cassino Tradition of the First Crusade: From the *Chronica monasterii Casinensis* to *the Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusolymarum*', in *Writing the Early Crusades, Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. by Marcus G. Bull and Damien Kempf (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2014), pp. 53–62.

Marcus G. Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony, c. 970–c. 1130* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

—— 'Views of Muslims and of Jerusalem in Miracle Stories, c. 1000–c. 1200: Reflections on the Study of the First Crusaders' Motivations', in *The Experience of Crusading: 1 Western Approaches*, ed. by Marcus G. Bull and Norman Housley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

—— 'The Relationship Between the *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*: The Evidence of a Hitherto Unexamined Manuscript (St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, 3)', *Crusades*, vol. 11 (2012), pp. 1–17.

—— 'The Historiographical Construction of a Northern French First Crusade', in *The Haskins Society Journal 25: 2013 Studies in Medieval History*, ed. by Laura L. Gathagan and William North (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2015), pp. 35–56.

Martha G. Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098–1180* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996).

Matthew Britt, *The Hymns of the Breviary and Missal* (New York, NY: Benziger Brothers, 1936).

Matthew Gabriele, *An Empire of Memory: The Legend of Charlemagne, the Franks, and Jerusalem before the First Crusade* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

—— 'The Last Carolingian Exegete: Pope Urban II, the Weight of Tradition, and Christian Reconquest', *Church History*, vol. 81 (2012), pp. 796–814.

Matthew Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History 400–1500* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011).

Maurice Keen, *Chivalry* (London: Yale University Press, 2005).

Michael T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307*, 3rd edn (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015).

Michael Markowski, 'Crucesignatus: Its Origins and Early Usage', *Journal of Medieval History*, 10 (1984), pp. 157–65.

Michael Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

Miriam R. Terresa, 'The Use of the Bible in Twelfth-Century Papal Letters to Outremer', in *The Uses of the Bible in Crusader Sources*, ed. by Elizabeth Lapina and Nicholas Morton (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 179–205.

Nancy F. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press, 1977).

—— 'The New Cornificius: Medieval History and the Artifice of Words', in *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography*, ed. by Ernst Breisach, Studies in Medieval Culture, vol. 19 (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications Western Michigan University, 1985), pp. 5–59.

Natasha Hodgson, 'Reinventing Normans as Crusaders?: Ralph of Caen's *Gesta Tancredi*', in *Anglo Norman Studies 30: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2007*, ed. by Chris P. Lewis (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2008), pp. 117–32.

Neil Wright, 'Epic and Romance in the Chronicles of Anjou', in *Anglo-Norman Studies 26: The Proceedings of Battle Conference 2003*, ed. by John Gillingham (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2004), pp. 177–90.

—— 'Twelfth-Century Receptions of a Text – Anglo-Norman Historians and Hegesippus', in *Anglo-Norman Studies, 31: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2008*, ed. by Chris P. Lewis (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2009), pp. 177–95.

Nicholas Morton, 'The Defence of the Holy Land and the Memory of the Maccabees', *Journal of Medieval History*, 36: 3 (2010), pp. 275–93.

Nicholas Paul, 'A Warlord's Wisdom: Literacy and Propaganda at the Time of the First Crusade', *Speculum*, 85: 3 (2010), pp. 534–66.

—— *To Follow in Their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012).

Nigel Saul, *For Honour and Fame: Chivalry in England, 1066–1500* (London: Random House, 2011).

Norman Housley, *The Crusaders* (Stroud: Tempus, 2002).

—— *Contesting the Crusades* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2006).

—— *Fighting For the Cross: Crusading to the Holy Land* (London: Yale University Press, 2008).

NBC Enterprises, *Operation Iraqi Freedom: The Insider Story* (Kansas City, MO: Andrews McMeel, 2003).

Patricia Skinner, '"Halt! Be men": Sikelgaita of Salerno, Gender and the Norman Conquest of Southern Italy', *Gender & History*, 12: 3 (2000), pp. 622–41.

Paul Rousset, *Les origines et les caractères de la première croisade* (Neuchâtel: LaBaconnière, 1945).

Penny Cole, David d'Avray and Jonathan Riley-Smith, 'Application of Theology to Current Affairs: Memorial Sermons for the Dead of Mansurah and on Innocent IV', *Historical Research*, 63 (1990), pp. 227–47.

Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200–1000*, Tenth anniversary revised edn (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013).

Peter Damien-Grint, *New Historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1999).

Peter W. Edbury and John G. Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Peter Raedts, 'The Children's Crusade of 1212', *Journal of Medieval History*, 3 (1977), pp. 279–323.

Philippe Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, trans. by Michael Jones (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984).

Priscila S. Boskoff, 'Quintillian in the Late Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 27 (1952), pp. 71–8.

R. Allen Brown, 'The Status of the Norman Knight', in *War and Government in the Middle Ages: essays in honour of J.O. Prestwich*, ed. by John Gillingham and James C. Holt (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1984), pp. 18–32.

Ralph H. C. Davis, *The Normans and Their Myth* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1976).

—— 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100–1400', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th ser., 4–7 (1994–1997).

—— *King Stephen*, 3rd edn (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013).

Ralph V. Turner, 'The *Miles Litteratus* in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century England: How Rare a Phenomenon?', *American Historical Review*, 83 (1978), pp. 928–45.

Rasa Mažeika, 'Pagans, Saints, and War Criminals: Direct Speech as a Sign of Liminal Interchanges in Latin Chronicles of the Baltic Crusades', *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 45: 2 (2014), pp. 271–88.

Raymond van Dam, *Remembering Constantine at the Milvian Bridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Richard Oram, *David I: The King Who Made Scotland* (Stroud: Tempus, 2004).

Richard W. Southern, 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing: I - The Classical Tradition from Einhard to Geoffrey of Monmouth', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series, 20 (1970), pp. 173–96.

Robert Bartlett (ed.), *History and Historians: Selected Papers of R. W. Southern* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), pp. 11–85.

Robert Levine, 'The Pious Traitor: The Man Who Betrayed Antioch', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*, 33 (1998), pp. 59–80.

Robert L. G. Ritchie, *The Normans in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1954).

Roger D. Ray, 'Medieval Historiography Through the Twelfth Century: Problems and Progress of Research', *Viator*, 5 (1974), pp. 33–60.

—— 'Rhetorical Scepticism and Verisimilar Narrative in John of Salisbury's *Historia Pontificalis*', in *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography*, ed. by Ernst Breisach, Studies in Medieval Culture, 19 (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications Western Michigan University, 1985), 61–102.

Ruth Morse, *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation, and Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Samu Niskanen, 'The Origins of the *Gesta Francorum* and Two Related Texts: Their Textual and Literary Character', *Sacris Erudiri*, 51 (2012), pp. 287–316.

Sarah Kay, 'The Nature of Rhetoric in the *Chansons de Geste*', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 94 (1978), pp. 304–20.

Sigbjørn Olsen Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury and the Ethics of History* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2012).

Simon John, 'Historical Truth and the Miraculous Past: The Use of Oral Evidence in Twelfth-Century Latin Historical Writing on the First Crusade', *English Historical Review*, vol. 130 (2015), pp. 263–301.

Sini Kangas, '*Deus Vult*: Violence and Suffering as a Means of Salvation during the First Crusade', in *Medieval History Writing and Crusading Ideology*, ed. by Tuomas M. S. Lehtonen and Kurt Villads Jensen, Studia Fennica (Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2005), pp. 163–74.

Sophie Marnette, 'Narrateur et point de vue dans les chroniques médiévales: une approche linguistique', in *The Medieval Chronicle: Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Utrecht, 13–16 July 1996*, ed. by Erik Kooper (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999), pp. 176–90.

Stanley Chodorow, *Christian Political Theory and Church Politics in the Mid-Twelfth Century: The Ecclesiology of Gratian's Decretum*, Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, UCLA, vol. 5 (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972).

Stanley J. Rachman, 'Fear and Courage: A Psychological Perspective', *Social Research*, 71: 1 (2004), pp. 149–76.

Stephen Lay, 'Martyrs and the Cult of Henry the Crusader in Lisbon', *Portuguese Studies*, 24: 1 (2008), pp. 7–31.

Stephen Moss, 'Hero or villain?', *The Guardian*, 22 May 2003, https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2003/may/22/military.warcrimes (accessed 26 September 2018).

Stephen J. Spencer, 'The Emotional Rhetoric of Crusader Spirituality in the Narratives of the First Crusade', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 58 (2014), pp. 57–86.

—— 'The Composition Date of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi (IP2) Reconsidered', *The English Historical Review* [forthcoming].

—— '"Like a Raging Lion": Richard the Lionheart's Anger during the Third Crusade in Medieval and Modern Historiography', *The English Historical Review*, 132 (2017), pp. 495–532.

Steven Biddlecombe, 'Baldric of Bourgueil and the Flawed Hero', in *Anglo-Norman Studies 35: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2012*, ed. by David Bates (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013), pp. 79–93.

—— 'Baldric of Bourgueil and the *Familia Christi*', in *Writing the Early Crusades, Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. by Marcus G. Bull and Damien Kempf (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2014), pp. 9–23.

Susan B. Edgington, 'The First Crusade: Reviewing the Evidence', in *The First Crusade: Origins and Impact*, ed. by Jonathan Phillips (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), pp. 57–77.

—— 'Albert of Aachen Reappraised', in *From Clermont to Jerusalem: The Crusades and Crusader Societies 1095–1500. Selected Proceedings of the International Medieval Congress, University of Leeds,* 10–13 July 1995, ed. byAlan V. Murray, International Medieval Research, vol. 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), pp. 55–69.

Susan Reynolds, Medieval *Origines Gentium* and the Community of the Realm, *History*, 68 (1983), pp. 375–90.

Suzanna A. Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance, 1095–1216* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

—— 'Christian Community and the Crusades: Religious and Social Practices in the *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi*', in *The Haskins Society Journal 24: 2012 Studies in Medieval History*, ed. by William North and Laura Gathagan (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013), pp. 95–126.

Sylvia Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City: Crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West (1099–1187)*, Church Faith and Culture in the Medieval West (Farnham: Ashgate, 2005).

Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

Thomas A. Dorey, 'Agricola and Domitian', *Greece and Rome*, 7: 1 (1960), pp. 66–71.

Thomas D. Hill, 'Non nisi uirgam tantum … in manu': Sigeberht's Monastic Aspirations (Bede, Historia Ecclesiastica III, 18)', *Notes and Queries*, 53: 4 (2006), pp. 391–5.

Thomas W. Smith, '*Audita Tremendi* and the Call for the Third Crusade Reconsidered, 1187–1188', *Viator*, 43: 3 (2018), pp. 63–101.

—— *War and the Making of Medieval Monastic Culture* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2011).

—— 'Glossing the Holy War: Exegetical Constructions of the First Crusade, c.1099–c.1146', in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, ed. by Joel T. Rosenthal and Paul E. Szarmach, 10 (2013), pp. 1–39.

Tim Collins, 'Colonel Tim Collins' Iraq war speech in full', *The Telegraph*, 19 October 2008, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/3562917/Colonel-Tim-Collins-Iraq-war-speech-in-full.html (accessed 29 September 2017).

‘UK Troops Told: Be Just and Strong’, *BBC News*, 20 March 2003, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/2866581.stm (accessed 26 September 2018).

Verena Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres: Studien zur Geschichtsschreibung des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1990).

William Aird, ‘Sweet Civility and Barbarous Rudeness: A View from the Frontier, Abbot Ailred of Rievaulx and the Scots’, in *Imagining Frontiers, Contesting Identities*, ed. by Steven G. Ellis and Lud’a Klusáková (Pisa: Pisa University Press, 2007), pp. 59–75.

—— ‘“Many Others, Whose Names I Do Not Know, Fled With Them”: Norman Courage and Cowardice on the First Crusade’, in *Crusading and Pilgrimage in the Norman World*, ed. by Kathryn Hurlock and Paul Oldfield (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2015), pp. 13–30.

William J. Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia c. 1095–1187* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2008).

—— ‘Religious Symbols and Practices: Monastic Spirituality, Pilgrimage and Crusade’, in *European Religious Cultures: Essays offered to Christopher Brooke on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*, ed. by Miri Rubin (London: University of London Institute of Historical Research, 2008), pp. 69–88.

—— ‘ “Holy Christendom’s New Colony”: The Extraction of Sacred Matter and the “Colonial” Status of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem’, in *The Haskins Society Journal 30: 2018 Studies in Medieval History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), pp. 177–212.

William Warren, ‘The Battle Speech That Defined A War’, 7 June 2016, https://www.forces.net/news/tri-service/battle-speech-defined-war (accessed 26 September 2018).

William G. Zajac, ‘Captured Property of the First Crusade’, in *The First Crusade: Origins and Impact*, ed. by Jonathan Phillips (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), pp. 153–80.

Index

Page numbers followed by "n" indicate note

Academica (Cicero) 26
Acre: arrival of the Third Crusade 170, 175; siege 189, 193–194
Acts of the Apostles 27, 67
Adam of Bremen 131, 140
Adhemar of Le Puy, papal legate 54, 56–57, 76, 77, 78, 81, 82, 87, 90, 95, 96–97, 101, 103, 105, 111, 112, 114
Ad liberandam 202
Ælfric of Eynsham 45
Aelred of Rievaulx, abbot 16, 21, 25, 38, 43, 44, 102n248, 128–133, 134–136, 144, 145, 147, 149, 151–152, 162, 165–166
Aeneas 23
Afonso I, king of Portugal 125, 126, 138
Agincourt, battle (1415 A. D.) 3
Agricola 6
Albero of Trier 130, 159–161, 163n235
Albert of Aachen 42, 77–78, 81, 82, 84, 88–89, 90, 92–93, 95–98, 101, 104–105, 109–111, 114, 115, 119
Alcuin of York 19
Alexius I Comnenus, emperor 66
Ambroise 42, 173, 175–176, 177–178, 180, 182, 190, 193, 210, 215
Ambrose, saint 104, 115
Andrew of Fleury 62
Andrew the Apostle, saint 53n26, 54, 61, 74
Anglo-Normans 20, 74, 123, 129, 133–135, 138, 144, 149, 151–153, 162, 164
Ansbert 191, 199
Anselm, saint 45, 126
Anselm of Lucca 117, 120, 141
Antioch 51 siege of (1097–1098 A. D.) 54, 55, 57, 60, 64, 66–67
apophasis, rhetorical device 1
argumentum 25
Aristotle 225–226
Arsuf, battle (1191 A. D.) 170, 177, 182–183
Ascalon, battle (1099 A. D.) 49, 51, 56, 61, 219
athleta Christi 59, 102
audience 10, 14, 19–20, 24–26, 32, 47–48, 87, 131, 190, 199, 215, 218, 221–222, 226–229; of orations on the battlefield 8, 17, 31, 84, 162, 207, 211–212; intended audience 10, 14, 34n117, 38–46, 75, 83, 114, 166, 175–176, 182, 190
Audita tremendi 169, 187, 192, 199, 206
Augustine of Hippo, saint 5, 16, 26–28, 82, 99, 217; Just War theory 89–90, 117, 139–142, 221

Bachrach, David 10–11, 130, 152
Baldric of Bourgueil 34–35, 36, 42, 49, 71, 74–75, 76, 79–80, 81–85, 88, 90, 91, 94, 95–96, 96–97, 102, 103, 106–107, 108, 111, 112–114, 115–117, 119, 147, 200, 214, 230
Balderic of Florennes 136
Baldwin I, king of Jerusalem 23, 72–73, 80, 103, 110, 116, 131, 159
Baldwin II, king of Jerusalem 72
Baldwin IV, king of Jerusalem 168
Baldwin of Boulogne *see* Baldwin I, king of Jerusalem
Baldwin of Ford, archbishop of Canterbury 174

Baldwin of Carew 183
The Battle of the Standard (A. D. 1138) 128–129, 134, 144, 146, 147, 149, 152, 209, 220
Bede 21, 27
Benedictines, order 38, 44
Bernard of Clairvaux, abbot 9, 29, 125, 126, 154, 159, 165, 178, 198, 200, 201, 202, 211
Bellum Catilinae see Sallust
Bellum Iugurthinum see Sallust
Bliese, John R. E. 7–8, 10, 11, 36, 50, 53, 54, 66, 73, 75, 80, 87, 90, 96, 116–117, 142, 218, 220, 224
Bohemond of Taranto 36, 52–55, 57–59, 61–62, 65, 66, 67, 72, 73–74, 75, 76–77, 78–79, 80, 81–86, 87, 90–94, 95, 97–98, 100–103, 107, 111, 112–113, 123, 135
Bohemond II, prince of Taranto and Antioch 73
Bongars, Jacques 51, 173
Bourgthéroulde, battle (1124 A. D.) 43
Bouvines, battle (1214 A.D.) 35, 205, 209, 214
Bull, Marcus 43, 76, 127n31

Catilina 1
Caedwalla 21
Caesar 2, 204–205
Carmen in victoriam Pisanorum 52
Cassiodorus 28, 29
Ceolwulf, king of Northumbria 21
Chanson d'Antioche 206
chanson de geste 34–35, 37, 48, 52, 74, 98, 103, 116, 176, 183
Chanson de Jérusalem 206
Chibnall, Marjorie 34–35, 46
Christ 2, 23–24, 31, 37, 39, 58–59, 61–67, 76–77, 81–83, 94–95, 96, 98, 103, 104–105, 106, 108–112, 114, 118, 120, 126, 132, 142, 149, 150, 152, 153–154, 155, 156, 158–160, 181, 185, 192, 195, 196, 198–200, 203, 205, 206, 207–208, 209–212, 214, 215; military service to 9, 15, 208, 212
Chronicles (Old Testament) 2
Chronicon Anglicanum see Ralph of Coggeshall
Chronica de gestis consulum Andegauorum 106
Chronicon de rebus gestis Ricardi Primi see Richard of Devizes
Cicero 1, 14, 18–19, 20, 21–27, 33, 46
Cistercians 38, 44, 154, 165, 198
Civetot, battle (1096 A. D.) 111
Cluny 63
Collins, Tim, colonel 216–217
Concordat of Worms (1122 A. D.) 165
Confessiones 28
Conrad III, king of Germany 125
Constantine I, emperor 62
contemptus mundi 67, 104
Council of Clermont (1095 A.D.) 49, 57, 76, 111, 117, 118, 199, 217
Courage 1, 2, 5, 12, 16, 19, 36, 39, 44, 61, 82–84, 102, 108, 127–129, 132, 137, 180–181, 186–187, 188, 193–194, 199–200, 207, 215, 225–228, 229
Crusade, crusading 37, 53–54, 56, 58–65, 68–67, 69, 75, 82–83, 85, 86–87, 88–89, 93, 95, 98–99, 100–101, 110–111, 115, 118–120, 124–125, 138–139, 155, 158, 161, 163–164, 176–177, 183, 195, 198, 199, 207–208, 221–223; First Crusade expedition 12–14, 20, 30–32, 34, 36–38, 42, 45, 48, 49–50, 51–52, 56–60, 64–67, 68–69, 70, 81–86, 87, 89–90, 91–94, 98–99, 102, 105–106, 107, 110–112, 118–121, 122–123, 127–128, 134, 136, 144–145, 150, 163–165, 191, 213–214; First Crusade sources 51–54, 71–80; Second Crusade 13, 123–124, 163–166; Third Crusade 42, 45, 167–169, 172, 174, 177, 184–185, 187, 188–189, 195, 200, 205–207, 208, 213–215; Fourth Crusade 198, 202; Fifth Crusade 167, 171, 173, 177, 198
Cur Deus Homo 126
Cyprus 185–186, 189, 211
Cyrus the Great 1

Daniel (Old Testament) 63
David, king (Old Testament) 100
De Bello Iudaico 33
De ciuitate Dei 28
De coniuratione Catilinae see Sallust
Decretists 139, 145, 163
Decretum, Concordia discordantium canonum 117, 147, 203
Dei Gesta per Francos see Guibert of Nogent
De gestis Britonum 43, 106
De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae 22
De expugnatione Lyxbonensi 13, 20,

124–125, 126–128, 132–133, 136, 137–138, 147–148, 153–154, 155–158, 164–165, 187, 197–198, 200, 203, 213
De Inventione 18, 20, 25
De laude novae militiae 126
De Oratore 18
De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem 13
De Rebus Gestis Rogerii Calabriae et Siciliae Comitis et Roberti Guiscardi Ducis fratris eius 52
Deuteronomy (Old Testament) 2, 30, 98, 170
divine aid 23, 61, 69, 96–99, 107, 108, 120, 127, 151–153, 161–162, 170, 178, 194–198, 219, 221, 223
Dorylaeum, battle (1097 A. D.) 54, 55, 57, 60, 64, 66, 72, 73, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81–83, 88, 90, 93–94, 96–97, 102, 104, 108, 112–113
Dudo of St. Quentin 34

Eadmer 25, 44–45
ecclesia primitiva 67, 112, 114, 122, 156, 203, 215
Einhard 21
Ekkehard of Aura 50
Elizabeth I, queen of England 3
Estoire de la Guerre Sainte 173, 174, 175–177
Eugenius III, pope 135, 165, 198, 201
Eusebius 28, 30, 62
Expugnatio Hibernica 8, 42, 89, 90, 194, 204, 213

familia Christi 95, 108, 113, 120
First Lateran Council (1123 A. D.) 163
Flemish (crusaders) 123, 125
Fortuna 187
Fourth Lateran Council (1215 A. D.) 168
France, John 71
Franks 64, 90–96, 97, 101, 104, 119, 136, 151, 188–189
Frederick, duke of Swabia 180, 192, 199–200
Frederick I Barbarossa, emperor 130, 137, 143–144, 146, 149, 157, 162, 164, 170, 173, 192, 196, 209
Fulcher of Chartres 33, 39, 42, 50, 71, 72–73, 76, 84, 86, 90, 97–99, 101, 103, 108–109, 131, 162
Fulk V, count of Anjou, king of Jerusalem 107

Galatians (New Testament) 27
Galbert of Bruges 11
Gallovidians 128–129, 135, 152
Geoffrey Greymantle, count of Anjou 106–107
Geoffrey Malaterra 41, 45, 52, 55, 68, 108
Geoffrey of Monmouth 43, 45, 106, 162
Geoffrey of Vinsauf 174–175
Gerald of Aurillac 45
Gerald of Wales 8, 16, 23, 40, 42, 45, 175, 186–187, 188–190, 204, 213
Gerard de Ridefort, master of the Templars 182, 184–185, 189, 197, 208, 211
Germans 64, 66, 123, 170, 175, 191, 192, 196
Gesta Alberonis 130, 136, 140, 145–146, 159, 161, 16, 165
Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum 34, 37, 39–40, 41, 44, 49–51, 51–54, 55–57, 58–60, 61–63, 64–67, 68–69, 71–72, 74, 76, 85, 88, 92, 102, 107, 112, 114, 218
Gesta Friderici imperatoris 130
Gesta Gvillelmi 62
Gesta Henrici II et Gesta Regis Ricardi 209
Gesta Normannorum Ducum 34, 58n50
Gesta Philippi Augusti 35, 184
Gesta Tancredi de Expeditione Jerosolimitana see Ralph of Caen
Gildas 22
Gilo of Paris 35
glory 1, 2, 6, 20–23, 36, 54–55, 80–81, 84, 118–119, 129–130, 133–134, 171, 178, 181, 191, 220; God-given 82–83, 132–133, 156, 158, 158–159, 160, 212; God’s glory 105 earthly glory 58, 87, 116, 122, 193–194, 218, 226
Godfrey of Bouillon, advocate of the Holy Sepulchre 77–78, 82, 84, 88, 92, 97, 105, 109, 114
Gospels 30–31, 47, 60; Matthew 30–31, 104, 109, 142n116, 172, 202, 206, 223; Luke 23n45, 31n95, 191; John 27n69, 84, 114, 179, 211
Gratian 99, 117
Gravi de pugna 99

Gregorian Reform movement 31, 37, 44, 47
Gregory I, pope and saint 28
Gregory III, pope 169, 199
Gregory VII, pope 58, 117
Griffons (Sicilian Greeks) 185, 199, 205
Guibert of Nogent 25, 34, 42, 49, 71, 74, 76–77, 87, 89, 90, 92, 98–99, 100, 103–104, 108–111
Guy of Lusignan, king of Jerusalem 169, 179

Hagenmayer, Heinrich 53
Hagiography 38, 44, 74
Hastings, battle (1066 A. D.) 7, 55
Helmold of Bosau 124, 131–132, 137, 140, 147, 150, 157, 161–162
Henry I, king of England 43
Henry II, king of England 131, 187, 204n171
Henry V, king of England 3
Henry of Huntingdon 16, 22–23, 27, 33, 39, 79, 86, 123, 129, 147, 149, 164
Henry of Scotland 130
Heraclius, patriarch of Jerusalem 168, 187, 204
Hervey of Glainville 20, 126–127, 133, 135–136, 137–138, 153–155, 158, 165
Hill, Rosalind 51, 53
Historia Albigensis 212
Historia Anglorum see Henry of Huntingdon
Historia Belli Sacri 73–74, 80, 108, 111
Historia Damiatina 175
Historia de expeditione Friderici I imperatoris 191, 196, 214
Historia Ecclesiastica see Orderic Vitalis
Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum see Bede
Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere see Peter Tudebode
Historia Hierosolymitana (Fulcher) *see* Fulcher of Chartres
Historia Hierosolymitana (Lisiard) *see* Lisiard of Tours
Historia Iherosolimitana (Albert of Aachen), *see* Albert of Aachen
Historia Iherosolimitana (Baldric) *see* Baldric of Bourgueil
Historia Iherosolimitana (Robert) *see* Robert the Monk
Historia Normannorum see Dudo of St. Quentin
Historia Peregrinorum 180, 191, 196, 199, 205, 214
Historia Vie Hierosolimitane 35
Holy Cross 51, 62–66, 68, 96, 100, 107–112, 118–120, 125, 153, 158–163, 172–173, 185, 192, 196, 198–203, 206–208, 211, 212, 215; relic 108, 125, 153, 159–160, 169–170, 199, 201; taking of 39, 63–66, 74, 77, 95, 104, 107–108; talisman 62, 107, 159, 168
Holy Land 13, 15, 30, 39, 109, 111, 123–124, 126, 131–133, 135, 171, 185, 188, 196, 198, 201, 206–208, 212, 213–215
Holy Sepulchre 51, 61, 64–66, 68, 96, 100, 106–107, 108, 109, 111–112, 120, 199–201
honour *see* glory
Horns of Hattin, battle (1187 A. D.) 167, 169, 199
Hrabanus Maurus 59
Hugh d’Avranches 45
Hugh (the Great) of Vermandois 76–77, 85–86, 106

Iberia *see* Portugal
imitatio Christi 63, 66–67
Innocent III, pope 167, 169, 172, 181n72, 192, 198, 201, 206, 214
Institutio Oratoria 18
Inventio 24, 46–47
Investiture Controversy 31, 37
Isaac Comnenus, emperor 205
Isiah (Old Testament) 2n6, 116n343
Isidore of Seville 142, 145–147
Islam 106, 155, 170, 185
Israelites, people 29–31, 93
Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi 167–178, 179–181, 182–184, 185, 187–188, 207–208, 213–215
Ivo de Vipont 177, 179
Ivo of Chartres 82, 126, 147

Jacques de Vitry, bishop and cardinal 178, 202
Jaffa 177, 180, 183, 194–196, 207, 210
Jerome, saint 27
Jerusalem, city 15, 49, 50, 54, 57, 59, 63, 65–67, 72, 75–77, 79, 80, 92, 94, 96, 103–104, 109–110, 112, 113, 118, 138, 170, 172, 173, 177, 192, 201, 206, 213; kingdom 9, 168, 177, 179, 201, 206
Job (Old Testament) 27

John, king of England 172–173
Joshua (Old Testament) 2, 30, 82, 139
Josephus 33
Judas Maccabeus 29, 45, 107
justice 46, 48, 115–118, 126, 130, 137, 139, 141–151, 163, 197, 203–208, 209, 213, 220–221, 223, 227
Just War theory 99, 117, 138–139, 141–146, 148–151, 163, 178, 198, 203, 214

Kempf, Damien 76, 227
Kempshall, Matthew 26
Kerbogha, *atabeg* of Mosul 52, 54, 61, 76, 78, 82, 86, 94, 105
Koran 31
Knights Hospitaller 177, 179, 182, 208
Knights Templar 174, 179, 182, 184, 208, 211

Latakia 79
Latin, amongst the laity 41–43
Latin Continuation of William of Tyre 175
lectio divina 29, 39, 46–47
Leo of Ostia 80
Libellus de expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum 9, 38, 174, 184, 187, 189, 191, 197, 201, 207–208, 211–212, 215
Lincoln, battle (1141 A. D.) 149
Lisbon 123–124, 126, 128, 131, 132, 133, 135, 137–138, 139, 146, 151, 154, 160, 164
Lisiard of Tours 23, 130–131, 140, 147, 162
liturgy 41, 44, 59, 102
Livy 33
Louis VI, king of France 86, 159
Lucan 33, 86, 186

Maccabees, books (Old Testament) 2, 3, 30, 36, 107, 170; people 9, 29–30, 45, 150, 184, 189, 206
Mahdia campaign (1087 A.D.) 52
martial virtues 8, 36, 50, 54–58, 68, 81–87, 97, 122, 128–131, 178–188, 218, 222
Martin of Tours, saint 20–21, 62, 130
martyrdom 29, 37, 45, 64–65, 99–107, 109, 115, 118, 120, 122, 152, 159–160, 183, 207–208, 208–212, 215
Mary, saint 61
material reward 56–61, 82, 87–90, 93, 97, 137–141, 144, 165, 191–194, 218–219
Maximus of Turin 90
miles Christi 31, 47, 58–59, 68, 84–85, 102
Military Orders *see* Knights Hospitaller; Knights Templar
Montecassino Chronicle 80
Mons Graupius, battle (83 A. D.) 6
Mount Cadmus, battle (1148 A. D.) 13
Muret, battle (1213 A. D.) 212

nationes, see gentes
Nicholas of Clairvaux 200
Nicholson, Helen 42, 167n1, 173–174, 177
Nicomachean Ethics 225
Northallerton *see* The Battle of the Standard

Odo of Cluny 45
Odo of Deuil 13
Oliver of Paderborn 175
oratio obliqua (indirect speech) 13, 17, 55, 177, 207, 210
Ordene de chevalerie 45
Orderic Vitalis 33, 34, 36, 39, 43, 45–46, 79–80, 83, 91, 97, 102, 108, 111, 116, 123
Origen 142
Orosius 28, 30
Otto of Freising 38, 157, 161–162

Passio Reginaldi 200
Paul, saint 30–31, 47, 58–59, 139, 141, 157, 202, 211, 226
penance 57, 63, 65, 98–100, 110, 112, 152, 163, 201–202, 223, 228
Peter, saint 30, 61, 152, 202
Peter Bartholomew 54, 61
Peter of Blois 200
Peter of Vaux-de-Cernay 201
Peter Pitões, bishop 126, 138, 139, 141, 146, 147, 154, 156–157, 158–159
Peter the Deacon 80
Peter Tudebode 39, 41, 51–52, 71–72, 81, 83–84, 88, 90, 102, 111, 112
Pharsalia 33n111, 185–186
Philippidos 35
Philip II Augustus, king of France 35, 170, 184, 190, 192, 194, 205, 214
Phillips, Jonathan 125–127, 133, 155
pilgrims, pilgrimage 44, 70, 92, 111, 169,

198, 215; crusade as pilgrimage 59, 63–64, 65, 105, 110–111, 119–120, 132–133, 136, 138, 153, 154, 171, 190, 195, 198, 199, 202, 214–215
Post miserabile 170–171, 177, 191, 192
Psalms 29, 37, 47, 60, 132, 152

Quantum praedecessores 133, 135–136, 148, 165
Quia maior 172, 202
Quintillian 20, 24–25, 39, 46

Rahewin 140, 150
Ralph Noel, bishop 129–130, 152
Ralph of Caen 74, 78–79, 87, 89, 93–94, 97–98, 103–104, 108, 111
Ralph of Coggeshall 38, 169, 187, 191, 195–196, 199, 203, 210, 214
Ralph of Diceto 173, 175
Ramla, battle (1101 A. D.) 23
Raymond of Aguilers 50, 59
Raymond VI, count of Toulouse 54, 66, 72, 76–77, 90, 111
Relatio de Standardo 16, 21, 128–130, 133, 134–135, 136, 140, 145, 149, 151–152, 161, 162, 165–166
Reynald of Châtillon 169, 200
Revelation (New Testament) 30–31
revenge *see* vengeance
Rhetorica ad Herennium 16, 18, 22, 46
rhetorical manuals 18, 26, 46–47
Richard de Templo, canon of Holy Trinity, London 167n1, 173–174
Richard of Devizes 185–186, 187, 190–191, 194–195, 197, 199, 205, 207, 208, 211, 213–215
Rigord 188–189
Riley-Smith, Jonathan 60, 113
Robert I, duke of Flanders 62, 72, 77–78, 82, 84, 97, 114
Robert II Curthose, duke of Normandy 61, 72, 79, 86, 93, 104
Robert the Monk 35, 37–38, 75, 77, 80–81, 82, 87–88, 90, 92, 95, 96–97, 98, 102–103, 110, 111, 112, 114, 151
Roger des Moulins, master of the Hospital 168, 197, 211–212, 215
Roger of Howden 173, 175, 185–186, 193–194, 195, 197, 199, 201, 205, 207, 211, 213, 214
Roger of Salerno, prince of Antioch 163–164
Roman law 19
Romans (New Testament) 30–31, 95n203, 114, 211

Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Ayyūb, Sultan of Egypt and Syria 168–170, 173, 174, 179, 181, 184, 198
Sallust 1–2, 7, 19, 25, 32–33, 47
Second Lateran Council (1139 A. D.) 165
Shakespeare 3
Shame 36, 40, 83, 87, 94, 132, 133, 148, 149, 181–183, 189, 199–200, 220
Sicily 135, 185, 186, 199, 205, 207
Simon de Montfort 212
sin 22, 27, 30, 39, 40, 46, 61, 63–64, 86, 98, 100–101, 115, 117, 119–120, 123, 127–128, 130, 132, 135, 138–139, 141–143, 149, 153, 158, 160, 161–163, 169–171, 177, 178–179, 183, 185, 187, 190, 191–192, 196, 197, 201–202, 203, 205, 206, 210–211, 212, 213, 215, 217, 219, 222, 223
Slavs 124, 131, 137, 140, 150
Smalley, Beryl 19
Song of Moses 30
Spencer, Stephen 174n41
Spring of Cresson (1187 A. D.) 168, 211
Staunton, Michael 38
Stephen of Blois 72
Suffering 30, 45–46, 64–65, 67, 82–83, 98, 99–107, 120, 122, 130, 158–163, 200, 210–211, 219, 223
Sulpicius Severus 20

Tacitus 6–7
Tancred of Hauteville 61, 78–79, 89, 93, 104
Thietmar of Merseburg 22
Throop, Susanna 150, 155–157, 160–161, 163, 164, 208
Timothy (New Testament) 31, 58
Topographica Hibernica 23
Trivium 18
Turks 54, 61, 64, 66, 84, 92, 101–102, 180, 182, 185, 190, 199
Tyrannius Rufinus 62
Tyerman, Christopher 169, 198

Urban II, pope 49, 58, 83, 84, 87, 95, 100, 104, 109, 172, 198, 202
Urban III, pope 169

vengeance 9, 88–89, 95, 115–118, 137,

141–151, 163–164, 166, 184, 186, 203–208, 212, 221, 223
Vegetius 40–41
Virgil 2, 23
vita Karoli 21

Walter the Chancellor 163–164
Wends 124, 131
Widukind of Corvey 33, 131
William I, king of England 55, 134
William of Malmesbury 25, 39–40, 79, 217–218
William of Newburgh 18, 173, 175
William of Préaux 180, 181, 183
William of Poitiers 7, 33, 55, 203
William of Tyre 136, 140, 147, 150, 159, 162, 175
William Rufus, king of England 110–111
William the Breton 35, 184, 205, 209, 214

Xenophon 1